

MAR 4 1929

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF ALIC.

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. A. C. CLARK, LL.D., F.B.A., *representing the Council of the Classical Association.*
Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., *representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, *Harvard University*, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, *University of Cape Town.*

Vol. XLIII

FEBRUARY, 1929

No. 1

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
CAMPANARUM CANTICUM	1	REVIEWS (continued):	
SIR JOHN MURRAY	1	<i>Hérondas, Mimes</i> (Nairn-Laloy). A. D. KNOX	24
JANE ELLEN HARRISON	1	<i>Indogermanische Grammatik</i> (Hirt). J. FRASER	25
ALEXANDER WILLIAM MAIR	2	<i>Macedonian Imperialism</i> (Jouguet). W. W. TARN	27
<i>Zed's Týpavvos</i> . G. THOMSON	3	<i>The Greek Questions of Plutarch</i> (Halliday). M. CARY	28
NOTES ON SOPHOCLES: <i>Philoctetes</i> . J. C. LAWSON	5	<i>C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii, III.</i> (Klotz). H. STEWART	29
PLATO AND POETICAL JUSTICE. J. TATE	7	<i>Le Dialecte Laconien</i> (Bourguet). R. McKENZIE	31
TWO NOTES ON HERODES. A. D. KNOX	8	<i>Vergilio ed Enea</i> (Terzaghi); <i>Le Réalisme dans les Bucoliques de Virgile</i> (Hubaux). S. K. JOHNSON	32
HORACE: <i>Odes</i> I. 34, 35. L. A. MACKAY	10	<i>The Roman Legions</i> (Parker). A. M. DUFF	33
TWO NOTES ON LIVY V. H. HILL	12	<i>The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire</i> (Rostovtzeff). D. ATKINSON	35
BACCHAE 925-6. G. C. RICHARDS	15	<i>Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire</i> (Duff). M. CARY	36
THUCYDIDES VI. 34, 7. A. W. GOMME	15	<i>The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder</i> (Edward). G. B. A. FLETCHER	37
REVIEWS:		<i>Sénèque, Des Bienfaits, II.</i> (Préchac). G. B. A. FLETCHER	38
<i>Some Verse Translations</i> . M. R. GLOVER	16	<i>The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians</i> (Bury). J. G. C. ANDERSON	39
<i>A Cretan Statuette</i> (Wace). P. J. DIXON	18	<i>The Romanesque Lyric</i> (Allen). S. GASELEE	40
<i>Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens</i> (Bonner). E. W. V. CLIFTON	19	SHORT REVIEWS	40
<i>The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century</i> (Meritt). J. K. FOTHERINGHAM	20	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	44
<i>Die Sprache des Redners Hypereides</i> (Pohle). J. F. DOBSON	21	BOOKS RECEIVED	47
<i>Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker</i> (Köhler). A. E. TAYLOR	22		
<i>Hellas the Forerunner, II.</i> (Household). A. W. GOMME	23		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

New Volumes Ready December, 1928

Lucan. Translated by J. D. DUFF.

Cicero: Letters to his Friend. Translated by W. GLYNN WILLIAMS. In 3 Vols. Vol. II.

Cicero: Verrine Orations. Translated by L. H. G. GREENWOOD. In 2 Vols. Vol. I.

Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists. Translated by C. B. GULICK. In 7 Vols. Vol. II.

Epictetus. Translated by W. A. OLDFATHER. In 2 Vols. Vol. II.

Oppian, Colluthus, and Tryphiodorus. Translated by A. W. MAIR.

Plutarch: Moralia. Translated by F. C. BABBITT. In 14 Vols. Vol. II.

Procopius: History of the Wars. Translated by H. B. DEWING. In 7 Vols. Vol. V.

Descriptive Prospectus on Application to

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

e
han
mu

the
as
the
to
con
for
Ni
Ni
Sy
use
ho
ma
con
Me
Un
ma
utt
ven

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1929

CAMPANARUM CANTICUM.

*egregias animas, quae sanguine nobis
hanc patriam peperere suo, decorate supremis
muneribus.*

Lauda fortem, plange caram,
Vita dulcem morte claram,
Hoc solenni munere
Almae Matris iuventutem,
Suo patriae salutem
Peperit quae sanguine.

Redit annus, sonat hora,
Campanarum vox decora
Exaltetur cantico:
' Illi non gemebant sortem,
Ipsam non tremebant mortem:
Dormiunt in Domino.

' Studiis qui pacis nati,
Tubae sonitu vocati
Vadunt in pericula,
Atrox caelum perferentes
Hostis tela contemnentes
Dum servetur patria.

' Transierunt. Ne lugete
Quorum corpora quiete
Sunt sepulta placida:
Vitam surgunt in supernam
Gloriamque sempiternam
Mortui pro patria.'

FREDERICK A. TODD.

THIS Canticum has been adopted by the Senate of the University of Sydney as the official War Memorial Hymn of the University. It is meant to be sung to the tune from St. Edward's Sequence composed by Dr. Sydney Nicholson for use in Westminster Abbey. Dr. Nicholson, whose father, Sir Charles Nicholson, was the first Chancellor of Sydney University, has adapted it for use as chimes to be played at the hours on nine of the large bells of the magnificent carillon which has been constructed and placed as a War Memorial in the great tower of the University overlooking the city, thereby making it the familiar and constant utterance of the Memorial to the University and to the whole city. The

Canticum translates the message of the bells into words, which will be sung on Armistice Day, Anzac Day, and other War Anniversaries. The prefixed lines from *Aeneid* XI. 24-26, paraphrased in the first stanza, are inscribed on the University Roll of Honour.

The death of Sir John Murray should not pass without mention in the *Classical Review*. Not, in the stricter sense, a classical scholar himself, though at Eton and Oxford he had drunk of the fountain, he was a lover of the classics and a warm supporter of classical studies. For the twenty-five years during which the Classical Association has existed, he was not only the publisher of the Association, but one of its members, and took an active interest in its activities, as well as in the special work connected with the publication of its annual Proceedings, of its occasional pamphlets, and of the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* since the Association in 1909 took over the control of these journals. The fourth of the distinguished series who since 1768 have followed one another as heads of the historic publishing house, he inherited, maintained, and has passed on to his son and successor, John Murray V., a fine tradition of humanism. His own interests lay primarily in the field of English literature, specially that of the eighteenth and earlier nineteenth centuries, with which his house had a long and intimate connexion. His edition (1896) of Gibbon's *Autobiography* is a work of scholarship in the full sense, admirably executed. Those who at one time or another have taken an active part in the management of the Classical Association have a grateful recollection of his unflinching goodwill, courtesy, and helpfulness.

Jane Ellen Harrison: *An Address delivered at Newnham College, October 27, 1928, by Gilbert Murray, and published*

by Heffer of Cambridge for a shilling, is a tribute to a woman whose service to knowledge, not so much in what she wrote, perhaps, as in what she made others think, was great. The address was delightful to hear, and the reader will find it just. We will commend it with a quotation from a review of the second edition of *Themis* by the Swedish scholar M. P. Nilsson in *Gnomon* (IV.,

1928, p. 456): ' (Just because I differ with her here,) ist es mir ein Bedürfnis auszusprechen, dass die Werke der vor kurzem verstorbenen Verfasserin zu dem Anregendsten und Bedeutsamsten gehören, was ihre Generation über griechische Religionsgeschichte hervorgebracht hat. Sie hat gezwungen die Grundlagen zu revidieren und tiefer zu legen.'

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

HONOURS GREEK CLASS.

FRIDAY, 11th February, 1916.

For Unseen Translation:—

Αἴλιον, αἴλινον εἶπ', ἀνὰ γάλοφον αἴλινον εἶπέ,
καὶ κατὰ τὰς βάσσας αἴλινος ὄξυς ἔτω,
ἧ τε πάλαι φιλέονσα συνωμάρτευν φιλέοντι
πολλάκι παρ ποταμόν, νῦν προχέοιτο γόος.
ὥς γὰρ ἀνὴρ σαπρῷ ποτὶ δένδρῳ νῶτ' ἐπερισθεῖς
ἤλπισε θάκον ἔχειν ἄτροπον ἀτρεμέα,
ἀλλὰ τὸτ' ἐκκλινθὲν μέσον ἐρράγη, ὥς μοι ἐραστὰς
πιστὸς ἔμεν δοκέων, ὥς ἀπάτησεν ἐμέ.
αἴλινον εἶπέ, καλὸς γὰρ Ἔρως νεοσίγαλός ἐστιν,
πρῶτον ὑπηνάτου τὰν χάριν ὥσπερ ἔχων,
ἀλλ' ὅτε γηράσκη, κρνερός πέλει, αἶψα δ' ἀπέσβα,
ὥς δρόσος αἰόια τέρεται ἀελίῳ.
εἶτα τί τὰν κεφαλὰν κοσμήσομαι; εἶτα τί χαιτῶν
ξανθοῖσιν στεφάνους ἀμφιτιθῶ πλοκάμοις
νῦν γ', ὅτε μ', ἀψευδὲς δοκέων, ἐψεύσατ' ἐραστὰς,
νῦν δ' ὃ γ' ἐρᾶν φάσας οὐκέτι φασὶν ἐρᾶν;
αἰαί, Ὑμηττὸς ἐμοὶ στορέσει λέχος, οὐχ Ὑμέναιος
οὐ νύ με νυμφοκόμος δέξεται εἰς θάλαμον,
οὐκέτι κραναῖον πάσομαι γάνος, ἀλλ' ἀπ' Ἰλισσοῦ
πίομ', ἐπεὶ ψεύστας ἔκ με λέλοιπεν ἀνὴρ.
αἰαί ἐμοί, Βορέα μετοπωρινέ, πανί' ἀΐσει
φυλλοβόλων δένδρων κόσμον ἀποσκεδάσαι;
ὦ Θάνατ', ὦ πότ' ἐμοὶ τρίλλιστος ἐλεύσει; οὐ γὰρ
τὰν μελέαν βιοτὰν τάνδε φέρειν δύναμαι.
ἂ κρνερός μὲν ὁ κρνερός, ἐμοὶ δ' οὐ κρνερός ἀνία·
κεῖ κρνοῖς Βορέας, οὐκ ἀλέγω Βορέου·
οὐ ψῦχος τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐμοὶ τάδε δάκρυα κινεῖ,
ἐν δὲ θέρει κείνου χεῖμα προδόντος ἔχω.
ὥς καλὸν ἦν τὸ θέαμα βλέπειν, ὅτε τὰν ἐπ' Ἀθάνας,
τὰν ἀπὸ Πειραιῶς εἴρπομεν ἀμφοτέροι,
χὼ μὲν ἐφεστρίδ' ἔχων φαῖαν ἡγάλλετ', ἐγὼ δὲ
χλαῖναν Σιδονίαν χαῖρον ἐφεσσαμένα.
αἰ δ' ὅτε πρῶτ' ἐφίλασ', ὅτε πρῶτα συνήνεσ' Ἔρωτα,
ἦδε ὅπως εἴη δυσκατάπρακτος Ἔρως,

ἦ κεν ἐνὶ χροσῆα ψυχὰν κίστρα κατέκλεξα,
 ἐν δ' ἔβαλον κλέθροισ ἀργυρέαν βάλανον·
 αἶ δ' ἐμὸν αὐτίκα νῦν ὠδῖνα θοὴν προφυγόντα
 παῖδ' ἐπίδοιμι τροφοῦ γούνασιν ἐζόμενον,
 αἶθε δ' ἀποικομένην αὐτὰν ἐμὲ γαῖα καλύψαι,
 τύμβον ἐφερπίξοι θῆλυς ὑπερθε πόα.

On or about February 18th, 1916, the students who had attempted the above Unseen had the fair copy read out to them in a shy, sad, north-country voice. It was *O waly, waly, up the bank*;¹ for their Professor was no ordinary Greek scholar and no common teacher. Such contacts, and also the boyish warmth of

¹ F. T. Palgrave's *Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*, CXXXIII.; *The Oxford Book of English Verse*, No. 388; etc. Mair's version will be included in a forthcoming volume.

his friendships, explain the strange and subtle power of Alexander William Mair, of Keith, over many generations of Edinburgh students, from 1903 to his sudden death in November last. As a scholar he has left the impress of his sensitive touch on the text and interpretation of Hesiod, Callimachus, Oppian. To him, as he himself might have said, the Greek poets συνετοὶ συνετῶ ψιθύριζον, for he was, more nearly perhaps than any modern scholar, one of them.

W. M. C.

ZETΣ ΤΡΑΝΝΟΣ.

A NOTE ON THE PROMETHEUS VINCTUS.

THE character of Zeus in this play impresses us by its vindictiveness and brutality—an impression which, it is now fairly generally agreed, was the poet's deliberate intention. He has portrayed the new President of the Immortals as a cruel and violent despot for the sake of the sequel, which will show how in the course of ages Zeus learnt to use his power with moderation and justice. Thus the law of πάθει μάθος, which in the *Oresteia* was applied to the evolution of man, is applied in this trilogy to the evolution of God himself.¹ This view of the character of Zeus is confirmed by certain details in the characterisation.

Prometheus is escorted to the place of his confinement by Kratos and Bia, the constant ministers of Zeus (Hes. *Th.* 383-8), the one a symbol of his power, the other of the methods by which he exercises it. In his opening words Kratos bids Hephaestus enchain the prisoner, and so teach him to respect 'the tyranny of Zeus' (10, τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα).² Thus his own ser-

vant, who is proud of it, describes the supremacy of Zeus as a τυραννίς. This idea, thus clearly stated at the outset, is insisted on throughout the play: the rule of Zeus is described as a τυραννίς and Zeus himself as a τύραννος not once but many times by his own servants as well as by the victims of his power (cf. 238, 321, 326, 373, 762, 782, 787, 941, 974, 989-90, 1028). Clearly it is important.

The Greeks of the fifth century had behind them a long and on the whole unfavourable experience of τύραννοι, and found that, despite differences of time and place, these autocrats tended to conform to a certain type. That is the impression we receive from Herodotus, and Thucydides confirms it. Out of this historical background there grew up in the minds of the Greeks a traditional τύραννος type; and this tradition, already established in the time of Herodotus, may be traced right down to Imperial times. The tragedians availed themselves of it, as they availed themselves of other popular ideas, for dramatic purposes; and, since they could rely on the familiarity of their audience with such ideas, it was often sufficient merely to hint at them, allusively and implicitly, in order to produce the desired effect. Thus,

¹ J. Case, *C.R.*, 1904, pp. 99-100; and *Prom. Bound*, 1905, pp. 10-12; J. T. Sheppard, *Greek Tragedy*, pp. 62-64.

² I refer to Aeschylus in Wecklein's edition, to Sophocles in Pearson's, to Euripides in Murray's.

Mr. Sheppard has shown that Sophocles has added to his portrait of Oedipus the King many subtle touches of characterisation which cannot be appreciated without reference to the popular view of the *τύραννος*.¹ I wish to show that Aeschylus had already used the same method to delineate the character of Zeus in the *Prometheus*, only that in his hands, as we should expect, the allusions to current tradition are clearer and more explicit.

1. The characteristic of tyranny which was perhaps most offensive to the Greek, at any rate to the democratic Athenian, was the principle of autocracy which lay behind it. The tyrant was an irresponsible ruler, a law to himself: cf. Arist. *Rhet.* I, 8, ἡ μὲν κατὰ τάξιν τινα μοναρχία, βασιλεία, ἡ δ' ἀόριστος, τυραννίς. Herodotus makes his Persian nobles, disputing the relative merits of monarchy, democracy, and oligarchy, object to monarchy on this ground (III. 80. 3): κὼς δ' ἂν εἴη χρῆμα κατηρτημένον μοναρχίῃ, τῇ ἔξεστι ἀνευθύνῳ ποιεῖν τὰ βούλεται; Euripides puts the same argument into the mouth of Theseus in his dispute with the Argive herald (*Suppl.* 429-32): οὐδὲν τυράννου δυσμενέστερον πόλει, ὅπου τὸ μὲν πρότιστον οὐκ εἰσὶν νόμοι κοινοί, κρατεῖ δ' εἰς τὸν νόμον κεκτημένος αὐτὸς παρ' αὐτῷ. So, in the *Prometheus*, even the moderate Oceanus describes Zeus as τραχὺς μόναρχος οὐδ' ὑπεύθυνος (340), while Prometheus points the parallel still further (202-3): οἶδ' ὅτι τραχὺς καὶ παρ' ἑαυτῷ τὸ δίκαιον ἔχων. Cf. 419, ἰδίους νόμοις κρατύνων; 159, Ζεὺς ἀθέτως κρατύνει.

2. The tyrant distrusts his friends, and is suspicious of the best of his subjects. Athenians remembered the character of Hippias in his later years. Lucian describes the cares of kingship (*Gallus*, 25): τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, ὑφορᾶσθαι δεῖ μάλιστα τοὺς φιλάτους καὶ ἐκείνων αἰεὶ τι δεινὸν ἐλπίζειν ἥξειν. Hiero thought the same (*Xen. Hiero* IV. 2): καὶ τοῦτον τοῖνον τοῦ πιστῶς πρὸς τινὰς ἔχειν ἐλάχιστον μέτεστι τυράνῳ. Cf. Eur. *Ion* 625-8, δημότης ἂν εὐτυχὴς ζῆν ἂν θέλωμι μᾶλλον ἢ τυράννος ὢν, ᾧ τοὺς

πονηροὺς ἡδονὴ φίλους ἔχειν, ἐσθλοὺς δὲ μισεῖ κατθανεῖν φοβούμενος; Plat. *Rep.* VIII. (567), ὁξέως ἄρα δεῖ ὄραν αὐτόν (sc. τὸν τυράννον) τίς ἀνδρείος, τίς μεγαλόφρων, τίς φρόνιμος, τίς πλούσιος· καὶ οὕτως εὐδαίμων ἐστὶν ὥστε τοῦτοις ἅπασιν ἀνάγκη αὐτῷ, εἴτε βούλεται εἴτε μὴ, πολεμῶ εἶναι καὶ ἐπιβουλεύειν, ἕως ἂν καθήρῃ τὴν πόλιν. No wonder his friends regarded him as treacherous. Prometheus exclaims (237-41): τοιάδ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὁ τῶν θεῶν τυράννος ὠφελημένος κακαῖσι ποίνασι ταῖσδε μ' ἐξήμεψατο· ἔνεστι γὰρ πῶς τοῦτο τῇ τυραννίδι νόσημα, τοῖς φίλοισι μὴ πεποιθέναι. Do we not recognise the symptom?

3. The tyrant tends to be proud, overbearing—a *ὑβριστής*. This is one of the epithets collected by Pollux as applicable to a bad king (Pollux I. 42), and his choice is confirmed by Herodotus (*loc. cit.* ἐγγίγνεται γὰρ οἱ ὑβρις ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων ἀγαθῶν), and by Sophocles (*O.T.* 873 ὑβρις φυτεύει τυράννον). This heightens the significance of Prometheus' great speech of defiance (939-59) and of his retort to Hermes, the emissary of Zeus (1002): οὕτως ὑβρίζειν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντας χρεών.

4. The tyrant was unyielding, inexorable, hard to appease or persuade—*ἀπαραίτητος* (Lucian, *Tyrann.* 16 δεσπότης ἀπαραίτητος), *δυσπρόσιτος*, *δυσπρόσοδος* (Pollux, *loc. cit.*). This is how Zeus is described by Hephaestus, by the Oceanids, and by Prometheus himself: 34 Διὸς γὰρ δυσπαραίτητοι φρένες, 199-201 ἀκίχνητα γὰρ ἦθεα καὶ κέαρ ἀπαράμυθον ἔχει Κρόνου παῖς, 349 πάντως γὰρ οὐ πείσεις νιν· οὐ γὰρ εὐπιθής.

5. If wealth made the tyrant proud, fear made him violent. *Βίαιος*, *ὠμός* are epithets applied to him by Pollux (*loc. cit.*): cf. Solon *fr. ap.* Plut. *Sol.* 14 τυραννίδος δὲ καὶ βίης ἀμείλιχον οὐ καθηφάμην; Lucian, *Tyrann.* 16 μᾶλλον δὲ τυράννος χαλεπώτερος . . . καὶ κολαστῆς ὠμότερος καὶ ὑβριστῆς βίαιότερος; Hdt. V. 92 (ξ) ὁ τοῖνον Περίανδρος κατ' ἀρχὰς μὲν ἦν ἡπιώτερος τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐπεῖτε δὲ ὠμίλησε δι' ἀγγέλων Θρασυβούλῳ τῷ Μιλήτου τυράνῳ, πολλῷ ἔτι ἐγένετο Κυψέλου μαιφονώτερος; Herodian VII. 1, 1 ἐκ πραείας καὶ πάνν ἡμέρου βασιλείας εἰς τυραννίδος

¹ J. T. Sheppard, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, pp. xlii-lviii.

ὠμότητα μετάγειν πάντα ἐπειράτο; Plut. *Mor.* p. 551 F ἐκ χρηστοῦ βασιλέως ἄγριον καὶ δρακοντώδη γενόμενον τύραννον. So Plato, *Polit.* 276 E καὶ τὴν μὲν γέ που τῶν βιαιῶν (sc. ἐπιμελητικῇν) τυραννικῇν, τὴν δὲ ἐκούσιον καὶ ἐκουσίῳ διπόδων ἀγγελαιοκομικὴν ζῶον προσειπόντες πολιτικῇν. Athenians again would remember Hippias: cf. Thuc. VI. 59 τοῖς δ' Ἀθηναίοις χαλεπωτέρα μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ τυραννὶς κατέστη, καὶ ὁ Ἰππίας διὰ φόβου ἤδη μᾶλλον ὢν τῶν πολιτῶν πολλοὺς ἔκτεινε. They would remember, too, the advice given to Periander by Thrasylbulus—the symbolical lopping of the tallest ears of corn (Hdt. V. 92 ζ): cf. Eur. *Supp.* 444-9 ἀνὴρ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐχθρὸν ἡγείται τόδε, καὶ τοὺς ἀρίστους οὓς τ' ἂν ἡγήται φρονεῖν κτείνει, δεδοκώς τῆς τυραννίδος περὶ πῶς οὖν ἐτ' ἂν γένοιτ' ἂν ἰσχυρὰ πόλις, ὅταν τις ὥς λειμῶνος ἡρινοῦ στάχυν τόλμας ἀφαιρῇ ἀπολωτίζῃ νέους; Sometimes his violence assumed an even worse form—he was lustful, licentious—ἡδονῶν ἤττων, ἀκρατῆς, ἐπιθυμίας ἐνδιδούς (Pollux, *loc. cit.*): cf. Hdt. III. 80 νόμαί τε κινεῖ πάτρια (sc. ὁ μούναρχος) καὶ βιαιῶναι γυναῖκας. Athenians would remember the story of Harmodius (Thuc. VI. 54): cf. Eur. *Supp.* 450-3 κτᾶσθαι τε πλοῦτον καὶ βίον τί δὲ τέκνοις ὥς ἂν τυράννῳ πλείον' ἐκμοχθῇ βίον, ἢ παρθενεύειν παῖδας ἐν δόμοις καλῶς, τερπνὰς τυράννοις ἡδονάς, ὅταν θέλῃ; Is not this precisely how Zeus treated Io in the *Prometheus*? He tried first persuasion, then threats, to bend her to his will (690-709). That is the method Prometheus expected of him (185-7), and it is characteristic of

the tyrant. The Sophoclean Oedipus adopts the same course in his endeavour to make the prophet Teiresias reveal his secret (*O.T.* 320-79), and again with the Servant (cf. especially 1152 σὺ πρὸς χάριν μὲν οὐκ ἐρεῖς, κλαίων δ' ἐρεῖς). So Thuc. VI. 54 καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ὁ Ἰππάρχος ὥς αὐθις πειράσας οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἐπειθε τὸν Ἀρμόδιον, βίαιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἐβούλετο δρᾶν . . . (implying that βία was the natural course for him to take). Thus, Zeus is a tyrant in the incontinence of his desires, and a tyrant in the way he forces his subjects to satisfy his lust. With these popular traditions in mind, do we not feel as keenly as Prometheus when, breaking off his prediction of the agonies to be inflicted upon Io, he cries (761-3): ἀρ' ὑμῶν δοκεῖ ὁ τῶν θεῶν τύραννος ἐς τὰ πάνθ' ὅμως βίαιος εἶναι;

Lastly, the tyrant's son is liable to prove worse than his father. That is why Lucian's Tyrannicide claims even greater credit for the murder of the son than for the murder of the father (*Tyrann.* 4, 5, 16). Athenians would contrast Hippias with Peisistratus, and Periander with Cypselus (cf. Hdt. V. 92 ζ, quoted above). Thus, when Hephaestus says (35) ἅπας δε τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῇ (marked as a γνῶμη by the Scholiast), he implies that it is natural for a young king like Zeus to be worse than his father, and further that in time the same king will learn to use his power more wisely: 203-8 ἀλλ' ἔμπας, δῖω, μαλακογνώμων ἔσται ποθ' ὅταν ταύτῃ ραισθῇ· τὴν δ' ἀτέραμνον στορέσας ὀργὴν εἰς ἀρθμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ φιλότῃτα σπεύδων σπεύδοντί ποθ' ἤξει.

GEORGE THOMSON.

NOTES ON SOPHOCLES, *PHILOCTETES*.

187-90.

βαρεῖ-
-α δ' ἀθυρόστομος
ἀχῶ τηλεφανῆς πικρᾶς
οἰμωγᾶς ὑπόκειται.

Two words in this passage are admittedly corrupt, *βαρεῖα*, which has a short final syllable where a long is required by metre, and *ὑπόκειται*, which must be rejected on grounds both of construction and of meaning. Some dozen emendations of the latter have been proposed, which with singular unanimity assume

that the *ὑπο* is sound and totally disregard the evidence of the scholia to the contrary. The scholia contain three several renderings of some verb in the passage other than *ὑπόκειται* and apparently not compounded with *ὑπο*. These are (1) αἰεὶ δὲ ὀδυρομένου αὐτοῦ ἡχῶ πρὸς τὸν ὀδυρμὸν ἀντιφθέγγεται, (2) μήκοθεν φαινόμενη (ἡχῶ) διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ἀντι οἰμῶζει, καὶ (3) τὴν ἡχῶ πόρρωθεν ἀνεγείρει, the two last having been copied in L as if forming one sen-

tence, whereas obviously they are, as interpretations, mutually incompatible. If then we can find synonyms of ἀντιφθέγγεται, ἀντι οἰμῶζει, and ἀνεγείρει which present a close similarity of form, we shall be on the track of the word which the passage requires.

Assume then that ἀντιφθέγγεται is a rendering of ἀντικλάζει (used by Euripides, *Androm.* 1145, of an echo) or possibly, in view of what follows, of a double compound ἀντανακλάζει, that ἀντι οἰμῶζει is a rendering of ἀντανακαλείται (cf. for the middle voice *Philoct.* 939), and that ἀνεγείρει is a rendering of ἀνακαλείται. What was the rare and puzzling word, appropriate to an echo, which gave rise to the misreadings or conjectures (1) ἀντικλάζει (or ἀντανακλάζει), (2) ἀντανακαλείται, and (3) ἀνακαλείται? By a curious chance we have only to take any syllables common to two out of the three variants in order to build up our word: ἀντ and κλα are found in Nos. (1) and (2), ἀνα and ται in Nos. (2) and (3): there results ἀντανακλάται, an almost technical word denoting the reflection of light or the repercussion of sound. The apocryphal book of Wisdom, a work of poetically rich vocabulary, contains a phrase (XVII. 19) based perhaps on this very passage—ἡχώ ἐκ κοιλότητος ὀρέων ἀντανακλωμένη.

Metre however forbids the admission of ἀντανακλάται to the text, and I suggest therefore that the double compound was itself a corruption of, or gloss upon, ἀνακλάται, which was used in the same sense by Aristotle and Theophrastus, and would appear to be the earlier form.

As regards βαρεῖα, S. Mekler's suggestion ὀρεῖα, which Jebb admitted to his text, may be right; but if the scholiast's note quoted above (ἀεὶ δ' ὀδυρομένου, etc.) may guide us here again, we should perhaps read:

ἀεὶ δ'
ἄρ' ἀθυρόστομος
ἀχὼ τηλεφανῆς πικρὰς
οἰμωγὰς ἀνακλάται.

324. θυμῷ γένοιτο χεῖρα πληρῶσαι ποτε.

Lambinus' suggestion of θυμὸν and χεῖρὶ has the merit of making sense of the passage, but ignores completely the scholia, which, explaining θυμῷ by ὀργῇ and χεῖρα by τὴν πρᾶξιν (= presumably

the exaction of vengeance), confirm incidentally the correctness of the cases which our MSS. give. But the scholia do more than this: they contain also a paraphrase of the whole line—εἴθε γένοιτό μοι ὀργισμένῳ ὁρμησὶς κατ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἐνδείξασθαι—in which τὴν δύναμιν ἐνδείξασθαι is, I believe, a rendering of χεῖρα + some verb which was corrupted into πληρῶσαι. The true reading then, I suggest, is χεῖρα πυργῶσαι, a phrase with which the dative θυμῷ can readily be associated (cf. *Aesch. Pers.* 192, *Eurip. H.F.* 238, 474, *Or.* 1568, *Rhes.* 122). The scholiast's δύναμιν ἐνδείξασθαι is an adequate prose paraphrase of χεῖρα πυργῶσαι, but not of Lambinus' θυμὸν πληρῶσαι.

327-8. τίνος γὰρ ὤδε τὸν μέγαν
χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλὼν ἐλήλυθας;

The construction of χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλὼν has found its apologists and certainly needed them. Professor Pearson's recent suggestion ἐκκαλὼν is attractive, although a doubt may be felt whether he succeeds in justifying the use of ἐκκαλὼν in lieu of ἐκκαλούμενος. I should prefer ἐγκοτῶν. A nodding scribe might readily, after writing ἐγκλημα just before, have converted the rare word ἐγκοτῶν into ἐγκαλὼν. The construction would, I think, present no difficulty; for though ἐγκοτεῖν used alone (to judge by a solitary passage, *Aesch. Choeph.* 41), like other verbs denoting anger, governed a dative, the preceding half of the phrase τὸν μέγαν χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν may be regarded as having moulded the construction before ἐγκοτῶν is spoken. The word would be particularly appropriate here because it indicates a sullen and resentful anger which is nursed.

782. ἀλλὰ δέδοικ' ὦ παῖ μὴ μ' ἀτελὲς εὐχή.

Here the restoration of the text must be purely conjectural; for there are no scholia. I feel that ἀλλὰ δέδοικα may be a gloss on δειδίσσομαι δέ (used intransitively), but it is with the end of the line that I am chiefly concerned. I assume that the final word εὐχή is very probably a corruption of τύχη. If so, what is the subject of that verb? Clearly it would have to be supplied from the sentence just spoken by Neo-

ptolemus—γένονται δὲ πλοῦς οὐρίος τε κεῦσταλής, etc. May not then this phrase not only provide πλοῦς as a subject but suggest a fitting predicate in place of ἀτελής? I would write:

(? δεῖσσομαι δὲ) μὴ μάλ' ἀσταλής τύχη.

The phrase is at least plausible, and closer to the MSS. than many emendations that have been offered; the rare ἀσταλής (not actually found in the sense required here) would very readily be corrupted into the familiar ἀτελής.

1252-3. NE. ἀλλ' οὐδέ τοι σῇ χειρὶ πείθομαι το δρᾶν.
ΟΔ. οὐ τᾶρα Τρωσιν, ἀλλὰ σοὶ μαχοῦμεθα.

These lines cannot stand in their present position unless a lacuna be assumed in the text before them. This assumption Jebb makes, giving to Odysseus, as the sense of the missing line, the words 'But I will compel thee.' But words to a similar effect have been used by Odysseus only a few lines earlier (1242-3) in reply to Neoptolemus:

NE. τί φῆς; τίς ἔσται μ' οὐπικωλύσων τάδε;
ΟΔ. ξύμπας Ἀχαιῶν λαός, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐγώ.

It is at this point of the dialogue that the two lines fit; οὐδέ τοι σῇ χειρὶ

answers immediately the emphatic ἐγώ, and μαχοῦμεθα very naturally reverts to the plural subject 'the whole Achaean host and I among them.' What then of Neoptolemus' next line (1244)? The retort

σοφὸς πεφυκὼς οὐδὲν ἐξανδᾶς σοφόν,

if apposite after line 1243, must be at least equally apposite after line 1253, which bears the same general sense. But the tone of the latter, 'so it is not the Trojans but you against whom we are to fight,' is the tone of a gibe rather than a threat, and on that account invites more readily the personal retort.

The two stray lines may therefore be restored to their home between 1243 and 1244, provided that sequence of thought in the passage from which they are removed is also restored by their removal. The lines in question will run:

1250. ΟΔ. στρατὸν δ' Ἀχαιῶν οἱ φοβέι, πράσσω
τάδε;
1251. NE. ξὺν τῷ δικαίῳ τὸν σὸν οὐ ταρβῶ φόβον.
1254. ἔστω τὸ μέλλον.

Clearly the suggested transposition stands this test too.

J. C. LAWSON.

PLATO AND POETICAL JUSTICE.

THAT Plato required the poets to preach and illustrate a necessary connexion between virtue and worldly prosperity, and between vice and adversity, bids fair to become an established 'fact' in the history of literary criticism. No less an authority than Butcher has given it countenance.¹ Pointing out that 'the prosaic justice, misnamed poetical, which rewards the good man and punishes the wicked,' was considered by Aristotle² appropriate to comedy rather than to tragedy, he invites us³ to 'contrast Plato, who would compel the poet to exhibit the perfect requital of vice and virtue.'

As this is the only extant piece of

literary criticism in which the adjective 'prosaic' is applied to the plot of the *Odyssey*,⁴ Butcher's disapproval of poetical justice, and of Plato for insisting on it, need not carry much weight. But did Plato so insist? If we give the term 'poetical justice' its ordinary meaning, the answer unmistakably is that he did not.

Poetical justice means that the good man is rewarded not only with an internal happiness, but also, and chiefly, with an external prosperity, and that the evil man suffers not merely some sort of inward remorse, but also, and chiefly, outward pains and penalties. It is the instinct for poetical justice which is satisfied when Job receives twice as much as he had before his sufferings. Poetical justice was the demand of Dr.

¹ Aristotle's *Theory of Poetry*, pp. 224-5. It has been repeated by, e.g., Spingarn (*Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, I, p. lxxiii), who, writing on poetical justice, says: 'Plato had indeed insisted on such a dual scheme of rewards and punishments.'

² *Poet.* 1453a, 30.

³ Referring to *Rep.* 392ab and *Laws* 660e.

⁴ Which is the example given by Aristotle (*loc. cit.*) of the plot which ends ἐξ ἐναντίας τοῖς βελτίοσι καὶ χειρότερον, and which is μᾶλλον τῆς κομῆδος οἰκεία.

Johnson when he held that Cordelia ought not to have died.

Now the whole task of the *Republic* (see 358-367) is to show that justice in itself is profitable to the just man quite apart from all question of external advantages or disadvantages which the practice of justice may or may not bring in its train, and by which the happiness which he necessarily enjoys is neither increased nor diminished (387d); the good man is happy even upon the rack.

This principle is so far distinct from the principle of poetical justice that Adeimantus actually complains (366de) that the whole question has been misunderstood and obscured by the poets, who have praised justice for the honours and rewards which accrue to the just man provided that he be reputed just; such praise merely strengthens the popular belief that it is better to seem just than to be just.

Accordingly in 392ab (to which Butcher refers), in order to prescribe the manner in which the poets are to speak concerning men, the conclusion of the discussion has to be taken as proved—namely (392c), that justice is a thing profitable to its possessor whether or not he be esteemed as just by gods and men, and whether or not he enjoy the honours and rewards which are the fruits of such a reputation. Hence the poets must represent good men as 'happy' (*eudaimones*)—a term which, as the context shows, does not necessarily include worldly success. The other passage (*Laws* 660) to which Butcher appeals is to the same effect: the poet ought to represent good men as happy whether they be great or small, rich or poor, strong or weak—that is to say, quite apart from all question of material reward.

The principle anticipated in *Rep.* 392 is further explained in 612-3. Normally the good man will be recognised as good by gods and men, and will consequently enjoy material welfare¹ in addition to happiness. He is, however, by no means exempt from poverty or disease or any other apparent misfortune. But we must believe that such circumstances will end in some blessing for him either in this life or in the next (*ζῶντι ἢ καὶ ἀποθανόντι*, 613a). This 'happyending' is not poetical justice, because the blessing which crowns the good man's sufferings is not necessarily in terms of worldly success, and is not necessarily conferred before he quits the stage of life.

Accordingly there is nothing to prevent the Platonic poet from violating poetical justice by making his virtuous heroes suffer all kinds of misfortunes, provided that he calls them happy, and permits us to retain our faith in the justice of the gods to be revealed either here or hereafter (*cf. Laws* 904); or by representing the wicked as prosperous, provided that he shows how advantages like health, wealth, and beauty (which are good things only to the just) themselves increase the unhappiness which inevitably attends upon injustice (*Laws* 661). *Non possidentem multa vocaveris recte beatum*. We ought not to ascribe to Plato the literary principles of Dr. Johnson, who regarded death as an evil (*cf. Rep.* 387d). Provided she refrain from all unworthy complaint, Cordelia may die for all that Plato cares.

J. TATE.

¹ Though, in the ideal state, not great power or riches, for in this case 'the half is more than the whole' (*Laws* 690). Plato is well aware that if the virtuous expected 'poetical justice'—i.e., great material returns for their services—his politics would be quite unworkable.

TWO NOTES ON HERODES.

HERODES V. 67: The slave Gastron is to be punished by the tattooer, who is to mark out a legend on his forehead:

65 Κόσιν τέ μοι κέλευσον εἰλθεῖν τὸν στίκτην
ἔχοντα ραφίδας καὶ μέλαν. μὴ δέῃ σε
ὀδῶ γενέσθαι ποικίλον· κατηρτήσθω
οὕτω ΚΑΤΑΜΥΟΣ ὥσπερ ἡ Δάου τιμή.

It is remarkable that no one has attempted to solve the difficulties of the

last verse and *κατηρτήσθω* by starting from the one certain thing that we know (or should know). However, we take *τιμή* (and I believe it means merely 'his honour Davus'), we clearly have an allusion to Davus and punishment, a function, so to speak, of the two. In these matters use is invariable. Whatever we may find in a corrupt text, or a

wilfully obscure author, the one function of speaking and of Jack Robinson is 'before you could say Jack Robinson.' An Alexandrine might say 'ere you quoth Jack Robinson' for the sake of obscure pedantry, and at the cost of an error in syntax and accident; but no writer could mean anything else. It is only the commentator who discovers strange connotations for the word 'to quoth' and exhumes from country churchyards the musty remains of forgotten John Robinsons.

Now we know precisely what Davus is typical of in this connexion. We cannot assume one special lost play. Still less can we say that Davus means slave, and that slaves were punished in such and such a way. There is one position or attitude typical of Davus, the plotter (Men. H. 1), who is afraid of the result of his plots, the dishonest and cringing slave. Horace advises the attendant on the great man (Sat. II. 5. 91):

Davus sis comicus atque
Stes capite obstipo multum similis metuenti.

The attitude is actually illustrated (perhaps from a very old date) in MSS. of Terence (Orelli, *ad loc.*). It is typical of the *σύννοος*, whether the plotting Davus (Men. E. 44) or philosophers (Persius, 3. 80), *obstipo capite et figentes lumine terram*. This 'hang-dog' attitude must be meant: but we may possibly question whether *κατητήσθω* is part of the 'hanging,' as in Lucian II. 410 *ἀμπελοι κατήτηντο βότρυνσι* seems to imply 'weighed down,' or whether it is used in the earlier sense *κατητήσθω* as an unfamiliar parallel to *δεδιδάχθω* 'let him be trained to wear a servile mien.' In either case the adjective *κατάμνος* is sufficiently cognate to the meaning of the verb to stand for an adverb and be qualified with *οὕτω*. It may be remarked at once that the evidence of the Herodes papyrus for termination is but slight: *κατοικεῖν* for *κατ' οἰκίην* (VI. 63) and *ἀμαρτίης* for *ἀμαρτεῖν* (IV. 95) can only be explained by the abbreviations *κατοικ'* and *ἀμαρτ'*: so that there is nothing against reading in the former sense *καταμύων* or the latter *καταμύειν*. For this reason I do not discuss the form *κατάμνος*. It appears incorrect: *ἐγκνός* is the nearest

false parallel:¹ but incorrect compounds are common in the Alexandrines. The question is what authority or excuse had Herodes to use *κατᾶμν*- in the sense in which Horace, possibly from the same source, writes:

capite obstipo multum similis metuenti.

The answer to this question is amazingly simple. No one before Lobeck seems to have doubted that *κατᾶμν*- could bear this sense. Lobeck's disproof is good for the common Greek use: but it has no application at all to a writer using, as Herodes does, a dead language. Here are the actual instances, in the dead language of lexicæ, of *καταμν*- (which Greeks contrasted with *ἀναβλέπει* in the sense of recover sight) being contrasted with *ἀναβλέπω* and meaning 'look down sullenly,' or 'timidly.'

(a) Schol. Hom. X 491 *ὅν ὑπεμνήμυκε: καταμέμυκε, κατεστύγνακε, κάτω βλέπει.*

(b) Schol. Ap. Rhod. II. 1219 *ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ μῶν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ἡ Ἡσίοδος (fr. 96. 86) πολλὰ δ' ἀπὸ χλωρῶν δενδρέων [ἀ]μύνοντα χαμάζε* (where *ἀμ.* would appear to be a variant inapposite with the sense illustrated).

(c) Hesych. *καταμεμυκέναι: ὑποπτῆ-ξαι*, which Lobeck (on Soph. Aj. 140) was perhaps wrong in referring to the sense of blinking with terror. For actually the Greeks summoned up courage by blinking (*μύσας φέρειν*).

(d) Hesych.² *κατάμ[ο]υσον: κατάκνυον*, which Stephanus took from *κατᾶμν*- (not Doric *κατᾶμν*-): the error is repeated by Foesius (*Lex. Hipp.*) and in Valpy's edition of the *Thesaurus*. We do not know Herodes' source: but I should hesitate to admit that H. was a better scholar than Stephanus,³ Foesius, or even Valpy. A phrase, in Sophron for instance, like *παιδίον κατάμνον*, might easily have misled

¹ *κισσόβρνος* occurs in the texts of an Orphic hymn. *καταμνής* would be credible: we should then have to assume that *κατάμνος* was an arbitrary and incorrect variation, like some in Kerkidas' hymns.

² For *καταμήσας, καταμύσας* should be read *vel invito ordine*.

³ 'Inclinata facie despice, oculos in terram defige.'

him. Or even, as a last resource, *κατάμνος* = *κάτω βλέπων* may, for some reason we do not know, be good Greek.

To sum up: I see eight possibilities:

(a) and (b) *κατηρτήσθω* (-*ίσθω*) *κατάμνος*, 'trained to a hang-dog mien.'

(c) *κατηρτήσθω κατάμνος*, 'hang his head sullenly downwards.'

(d) and (e) *κατηρτήσθω* (-*ίσθω*) *καταμύειν*, 'taught to hang his head low.'

(f) *κατηρτήσθω καταμύων* = (b).

(g) and (h) *κατηρτήσθω* (-*ίσθω*) *κατημύσ'* (αι), shifting all the blame on the textual tradition.

I would not stake my shirt on any of these, though (d) is my favourite.¹ But I would give very long odds against other interpretations.

Herodes IV. 46:

οὐτ' ΟΡΓΗ σε κρηγύνῃ οὐτε
βίβηλος αἰνεῖ, πανταχῇ δ' ἴσω <ε> κείσαι.

On v. 46 I have little to say except that *ἴσω* (Milne) is somewhat nearer the traces than *ἴσως*: whatever the

¹ Herodes normally gives together the method and the chastening result of punishments. But, of course, the motive of carrying low the head that he used to bear so high (*σελεῖν*) is to conceal the legend.

reading it cannot affect the difficulty of v. 46.

In the preceding discussion of V. 68 I have given sufficient instances from lexica for an unfamiliar meaning, if not for the precise form, of *κατάμνος*; for the meaning of ΟΡΓΗ as an enclosed space we lack confirmation, and *ὄρχμη* is not satisfactory in itself or an easy corruption. Whence then did Herodes get it? Immediately or mediately he got it, I imagine, from Soph. *Ant.* 354: *καὶ φθέγμα καὶ ἀνεμῶν φρόνημα καὶ ἀστυνόμους ὄργας ἐδιδάξατο καὶ δυσαύλων πάγων* <ν> *αιθρία καὶ δύσομβρα φεύγειν βέλη*. Here there is an obvious temptation to contrast *ὄργαι* with the *δύσανλοι πάγοι*, and accordingly Musgrave conjectured *ὄρχμās* (there is a variant *ὄρμās*), and others read *ἀγοράς*. 'Men learnt to make enclosures in city and flee from the cold and rainy wilds.' It is the modern fashion to emend: the old fashion was to put down against the word the sense you wished. So *ὄργαι* was supposed to mean 'enclosures,' and hence Herodes derived it. What accent and breathing the originator of this odd fancy gave the word I do not know.

A. D. KNOX.

HORACE: ODES I. 34, 35.

THE thirty-fourth ode in the first book of Horace is usually considered either an insincere poetic exercise or a somewhat unconvincing account of an improbable conversion. But though Horace, in his later life especially, may have shown certain leanings towards Stoicism, it is difficult to believe that he could ever have really subscribed to the unreflective orthodoxy here expressed, especially when the explanation, 'There must have been clouds somewhere even though I didn't see them,' would have been so ready to hand.

But is the poem the recantation that it appears at first glance? Or should it not rather be taken quite closely with 35, as in reality a very strong and uncompromising declaration of extreme Epicurean faith? The theme of both, under this view, is the absolute omnipotence of Fortune, and the purpose of the shorter poem is to serve as an artful

introduction to the more serious expression of faith which follows it. It is characteristic of the Horatian art not to say everything straight out in black and white, but rather to approach the central idea indirectly and by allusion; so this seeming recantation swings round in the last stanza as if irresistibly to the position ostensibly abandoned at the beginning. Horace is demonstrating dramatically that the first obvious and immediate conclusion from natural phenomena, and especially catastrophes, involves a reversion to a naïve mythology, but the least reflection displays the insufficiency of this and the necessity of returning to the Epicurean determinism after all.

For the all-prevailing power celebrated at the end of the ode is nothing but the unaccountable *Τύχη* that lies behind the Epicurean mechanistic philosophy. She is thinly disguised as

the will of Zeus, but the series . . . *Diespiter . . . deus . . . Fortuna* is probably quite intentional, and Jupiter fades completely out of the picture in a way that some term disjointed. But is not Horace, with poetic brevity, making the point, by allusion rather than direct statement, that there is no need to postulate a personal Jupiter? It is simpler to deify his incalculable and uncontrollable will as the capricious deity Fortune, whose power is essentially unbounded, and characteristically subversive. It is this idea of the absolute omnipotence of Fortune that is developed at length in the next ode, to which this serves as an artful introduction.

Ode 35 has incurred more than once the reproach of being disjointed and inconsistent, and indeed of saying exactly the opposite of what it must mean. But this is perhaps merely the result of our natural repugnance and revolt against the completely cynical and pessimistic view of the universe that it actually puts forward. Fortified by memories of Horace as the sunny and cheerful prophet of moderation and common sense, and the knowledge that the position if completely thought out is ultimately logically untenable, we forget that Horace had other moods, and that poetry may exist and be good without telling the whole balanced and considered truth about the universe all at once. Lack of unity and coherence is a graver fault in a poem than dubious metaphysics; and we pay a compliment to Horace the philosopher at the expense of Horace the poet, by insisting that he could not possibly have meant what he actually did say.

Should we not rather read the poem as a unity, expressing a desperate and complete surrender to the omnipotence of Fortune? The first part of the poem stresses, by a confused medley of enumeration, the power of Fortune over all sorts, conditions, and races of men. Necessity is her servant, making her acts absolute and unalterable by any other power. She alone has complete spontaneity. This is a popular and poetic expression of the orthodox Epicurean doctrine of the relation between the primal absolute unconditional

liberty of 'swerve' in the atom, and the subsequent rigid determinism which develops the results of this action, initiated by pure chance, along a line of inflexible causation.

The novel part of this theory lies in the treatment of the next lines, 21-24, *Te Spes et albo rara Fides*, etc. If we translate these rigidly, without reference to the context, we remark that the verb *colit* is a very strong one—to worship a divinity, almost to fawn on a human being—certainly there is usually something obsequious in its meaning. *Panno* again; *pannus* is usually anything but a complimentary word—rag, patch, or the like. It sounds like a deliberate sneer at the 'rags of respectability' worn by false faith. *Rara* offers some difficulty. On this interpretation it must either be ironical (= *egregia*), which seems most likely, or else imply, in the light of what follows, 'Rarely found, they say: rarely indeed; so rarely that in plain fact it doesn't exist at all.' Unless indeed both meanings were playing in Horace's mind at once. And the words *nec comitem abnegant* on the face of them do mean that when Fortune goes, Faith and Hope go with her. On this interpretation the *At* of line 25 does not mark a difference between the conduct of the *volgus infidum* and an elect few (not directly mentioned) whose unspotted loyalty withstands all desertions of Fortune, but is merely consequent on the negative *nec abnegat*, the construction being carried on through the slight change of subject. 'Loyalty does not disdain to accompany Fortune, but rather men desert the unfortunate in adversity.' It represents, so to speak, not μέν . . . δέ, but ἀλλά.

This interpretation, though the cynical, somewhat Hobbesian ethic expressed may be open to question on philosophic grounds, at least expresses a possible attitude towards the problem of virtue, and one that has been held and advanced; it also frees us from the awkward dilemma of supposing that Horace has actually said the opposite of what he really means, or with Wickham of making Fortune mean, without warning, two entirely different things in successive stanzas, at one time general, at another limited and particular;

which also leaves *inimica* very difficult to construe.

A paraphrase might run: 'Fortune is omnipotent. Necessity is her servant, and all the pretended virtues are her sycophants. All men are ruled by self-interest, and their devotion depends solely on the disposal of Fortune. When luck goes, hope goes with it, and loyalty, that whitened sepulchre, follows along too. As Fortune is the only power that matters, it is on her we call to preserve Caesar and restore the state.'

Some difficulty has been raised about *mutata veste*; it seems hard to picture Fortune as wearing mourning for those she has callously or capriciously destroyed. If Horace were more Pindaric, one might be tempted to take the *vestis* as referring to the house itself; but, after all, it is not strange that Fortune should in the eyes of the household itself be considered to wear one garb when she enters a house bearing prosperity and happiness, and another when she leaves it in ruin and misery.

L. A. MACKAY.

TWO NOTES ON LIVY V.

V. 7.7:

pedestris ordinis (se) aiunt nunc esse operam-(que) reipublicae extra ordinem polliceri.

EDITORS, accepting a suggestion of Cuperus, omit *se* and *-que* in this passage. But there are several reasons against this, and no adequate reason is advanced for it.

In the first place, all the MSS. used by Walters and Conway—*mira concordia*, as they say—have both the words, and the only variant, *seiciunt*, itself attests that *se*, at least, was present in the archetype. Moreover, it is by no means likely that these words can have crept into our text. The proximity of *ordinis* to *se*, and of *reipublicae* to *-que*, was far more likely to cause their loss than to produce them.

Grammatically, too, the emended text is not above suspicion. The use of the genitive *pedestris ordinis aiunt nunc esse* is not precisely similar to that expressing Duty or Characteristic. All the examples of that usage given by Roby and Madvig are generalisations, not applying to one particular case as here.¹

A third argument against the suggested change is to be found in the inconsistency of its supporters. In his note Cuperus says, *cur, quaeso, necesse habuerunt dicere se esse pedestris ordinis, et quidem 'nunc,' quod nemo senatorum atque adeo civium ignorabat?* This question is answered by Duker, who, though supporting the alteration, points out that the Plebs were *not* before this time *pedester ordo*, since plebeians might be

equites.² Hence the necessity to say that they *now* were. As for the word *nunc*, it has a very important part in the interpretation of the MSS. reading, as we shall see, so that it loses rather than gains in force by the omission of *se* and *-que*.

But, apart from these minor points, a careful study of the context reveals that the alteration, instead of improving the sense of the passage, spoils the whole point of it.

This use of *pedester ordo* to indicate the Plebs as distinct from Senate and *Equites* is, so the commentators tell us, the only such use of the phrase in Livy. This fact in itself is a strong reason for the assumption that Livy used the phrase, not as a mere synonym for *plebs*—or why did he not use it often?—but with some special point in this context. In Cuperus' reading it is simply a synonym for *plebs*, but not, as he implies in his note, in the MSS. reading, as we shall see.

The question of the title *equester ordo*, and at what period that Order became a *tertium corpus* apart from the Senate and the Plebs, is a very vexed one, and this passage has played an important part in the dispute.³ But whatever the ultimate solution of this problem, it is clear from the whole tone of the chapter under discussion that Livy conceived the volunteering of those possessed of

² This is clear, as Duker says, from Liv. IV. 13 and 15; IV. 38 and 42.

³ See, e.g., Belot, *Histoire des Chev. Romains*, Vol. I., Bk. II., Chap. III.; *id.*, Vol. II., p. 6; Marquardt, *Historia Equitum Rom.*, Chap. IV.

¹ Cp., e.g., Liv. VI. 39. 10.

the equestrian census to serve *equo privato* to be the first step in the formation of this third Order.

Up to this point the *equites* have been, in Livy's narrative, a purely military arm chosen indiscriminately from both patricians and plebeians, and having no civil status apart from those two Orders.¹ Now they receive official recognition as a separate entity. Throughout the chapter the contrast is clearly marked between *equites* and *plebs*,² and in § 10-12 the double contrast is made between *equites* and *plebs* on the one hand, and *equites* and *pedites* on the other. When the Senate—i.e., the civil authority—thanks the volunteers, it is as *equites* and *plebs*; when the Consular Tribunes—the military authority—thank them, it is as *pedites equitesque*.

This terminology cannot be accidental. It indicates the birth of a new Order in the State.³ Of course it is not contended here that the *equites* there and then gained a definite civil status. Such things do not come about so suddenly, nor would Livy intend to suggest so much in so few words. The new organisation is military in essence; but the important point is that here we have recognised for the first time in Livy the distinction between the class *equites* and the class *plebs* corresponding to the military distinction between *equites* and *pedites*. It is this fact which Livy wishes to bring out, and this idea of his, I submit, was led up to by the sentence *pedestris ordinis se aiunt nunc esse*, which anticipates the use of *pedites* below to denote the Plebs.

Those possessing the equestrian census met together and offered their services to the State as cavalry. At once the significance of this comes home to Livy, and, in his narrative, to the plebeians. This is the constitution of an 'Equestrian Order.' 'Now,' they cry, 'we belong to the "Pedestrian" Order, and we offer our services to the State.'

The phrase *pedester ordo* has a strong

dramatic effect, looked at from this point of view, and was coined, as has been said, deliberately to produce that effect. Having served its purpose it disappeared from Livy's narrative.

V. 18. 2:

omnesque deinceps ex collegio eiusdem anni refici apparebat L. Titinium, P. Maenium, Cn. Genucium, L. Atilium.

It is obvious not only that this passage is corrupt, but that the corruption is, as the Oxford text says, *confusio satis antiqua*.

The sentence quoted, with its context, contains two problems of which no editor has offered a satisfactory solution. These are:

1. The number of Military Tribunes, which is normally six (and in the Fasti of this same year, also, six), is here only five—the four named above and the plebeian P. Licinius Calvus.

2. The statement *omnesque deinceps . . . refici apparebat* can only mean that all the members of the *collegium* of the year of Licinius' former Tribunate were being re-elected. But the list of this *collegium*, as given in Chapter XII. 10, is as follows: P. Manlius, L. Titinius, P. Maelius, L. Furius Medullinus, L. Publilius Volscus, P. Licinius Calvus, of which names only one (apart from that of Licinius)—viz., L. Titinius—appears in our passage. Cn. Genucius and L. Atilius belong to the *collegium* of the year succeeding that of Licinius' first Tribunate.⁴

Editors are content to insert a name into the list given above. They print variously P. Maelium (taken from Chapter XII. 10 and Diodorus) and Q. Manlium (from the Capitoline Fasti), and place the name in different positions in the list.

This procedure disposes of the first difficulty (though in an arbitrary fashion which does not carry conviction), but leaves the second unsolved. The only serious attempt made to solve this second problem was that of Sigonius, who defended the MSS. reading (with the addition of P. Maelium) on the ground that *refici apparebat* means that

¹ See p. 12, n. 2.

² E.g., § 8, *non enim (plebs), sicut equites—laudari iussi*; § 10, *laudare equites, laudare plebem*.

³ Cp. in Bk. V. 23. 4 the use of *omnes ordines*, implying that there were more than two.

⁴ See Chap. XIII. 3.

the 'general impression' was that the same people were being re-elected, but that this later proved to be erroneous. The inadequacy of this interpretation is obvious. *Apparet* means 'it is evident,' not 'it seems,' and the word *reficio* is used again in § 4, showing that those chosen actually were re-elected.

It would be easy, of course, to ascribe the whole confusion to Livy himself, and to add it to the list of his careless blunders about names and dates. But Livy would hardly make such an unpardonable mistake when he had written down the names of the Tribunes concerned only six chapters before. He is here dealing, too, with a favourite subject—the *concordia ordinum* of the Early Republic—and it would be absurd to accuse him of gross neglect in a matter which he obviously regards as important. Moreover, he mentions two of the Tribunes concerned by name again in § 7, so that there is more here than a mere blunder of the historian.

If, then, we are to get any satisfaction out of the Latin we must be prepared to emend boldly, ascribing the corruption to some source at least as old as the archetype of our existing MSS., which are substantially in agreement.

In the first place, there is strong evidence that the name *P. Maenium* should be *P. Maelium*, and this, I suggest, should be read. If the words *ex collegio eiusdem anni* are to have any meaning at all, some names at least must be the same as in Chapter XII. 10. There we have *L. Titinius*, *P. Maelius*. The texts of Diodorus XIV. 47. 1 and XIV. 90 vary between *Maenius* and *Maelius*, a further reason for changing to the more probable of the two. Finally, the Capitoline Fasti give us three names and three cognomina unattached—two belonging to a Titinius and a Licinius,¹ and the third, *Capitolinus*, to a Maelius.² If we add to this that the context also supports the reading *Maelium*, as I shall show,³ it is

reasonably certain that we should make the alteration suggested.

This, however, leaves us with the main problems unsolved, and I suggest that they can only be solved by adopting what I believe to have been the original reading, viz.:

omnesque deinceps ex collegio eiusdem anni
refici apparebat <et insequentis, P. Manlius,>
L. Titinium, P. Maelium, Cn. Genucium, L.
Atilium.

This involves a considerable addition to the existing text, but I hope to show how the corruption might easily arise.

First let us see how well this reading fits the context. The whole of Chapter XVIII. deals with some *rapprochement* between the patricians and the plebeians in the matter of the Military Tribune. In his speech on the result of this election Licinius describes what has happened as *omen concordiae*, and expresses his joy at the people's choice.

Now in Chapter XVII. 5 we are told that an agreement was reached whereby the Military Tribunes of any year were to include a majority of plebeians. This was not likely to be conducive to 'Concord,' and it seems very probable that Licinius' joy was due to the fact that it was disregarded in the election just over, as it certainly was in the following year, when all the tribunes were patricians.⁴

The natural conclusion from all this is that a more equitable arrangement came about by the chance of the voting, and this could be nothing else but the election of an equal number of patricians and plebeians to the office.

The reading contained in our MSS. gives the names of three plebeians, P. Licinius Calvus, Cn. Genucius, and L. Atilius, and two patricians, L. Titinius and P. Maelius.⁵ We expect, therefore, another patrician name, which is supplied by the addition of *P. Manlium*. This addition, too, coupled with the alteration to *P. Maelium*, reproduces the first three names of the *collegium* of Licinius' first Tribune. Moreover, it

¹ See Oxford text *ad loc.*

² See Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*, s.v. 'Maelia Gens.' It is worthy of notice here that the cognomen *Capitolinus* is no support for the reading *Q. Manlium*, since the Manlii did not obtain the title until 390 B.C. (Liv. V. 31. 2).

³ See n. 5 on this page.

⁴ See Chap. XXIV. 1.

⁵ This is a further ground for reading *Maelium* for *Maenium*, since Livy calls Maelius a patrician in Chap. XII. 10. Smith's *Dictionary of Biography*, s.v., says that the Maelii were plebeian.

agrees with the Capitoline Fasti, except for the *praenomen* of Manlius (Q. in Fast. Cap.)¹ — a common point of divergence.

The second of our difficulties is removed by the insertion of *et insequentis*. This makes the presence of the names of Genucius and Atilius perfectly intelligible. All the names are thus explained, and brought within the definition contained in the rest of the sentence.

Translate: 'And it became clear that all the Tribunes in turn (*i.e.*, as the results were declared) were being re-elected from the *collegium* of the year of Licinius' former Tribunate and from that of the succeeding year—namely, P. Manlius, L. Titinius, P. Maenius, Cn. Genucius, and L. Atilius.'

It remains to explain the loss of the words *et insequentis* P. Manlius which I have inserted.

The length of a line in the Nicoma-

chean Archetype of Livy I.-X. varied from 17 to 21 letters.² The words *et insequentis* P. Manlius contain 21 letters, or possibly only 20, if we regard *et* as a single letter. Thus they might form one line. This line would be followed by the words L. Titinius, P. Maenius, a group of 17 letters which might easily form another line. Thus the loss of the words which I have inserted may have been due either to homoeoteleuton or merely to the close proximity of P. Manlius and P. Maenius.³

This reading, therefore, I submit, is supported both by the context and by palaeographical probability.

H. HILL.

² See Oxford text of Livy, Bks. VI.-X., Introd., p. xv seq.

³ Incidentally, it is possible that this similarity of ending is responsible for the reading *Maenium* for *Maenius*, the two endings *Maenium* and *Manlius* being telescoped by the scribe.

¹ See p. 14, n. 2 and Oxford text *ad loc.*

BACCHAE 925-6.

τί φαίνομαι δῆτ' ; οὐχί τὴν Ἰουὺς στάσαι
ἢ τὴν Ἀγλαΐης ἐστάναι, μητρὸς ἐμῆς P. μητρὸς γ' P.

ELMSLEY says 'γε hic valet *utpote*.' With the sense so given I have no quarrel. A son may take after his mother in pose and gait, and when he is dressed up in women's clothes the likeness may be accentuated. But does γε ever mean *utpote*? If any of your readers can give me a real instance, *do manus*. Till then I shall think that the second hand simply inserted γ' *metri gratia*, as beginners in Greek verse are wont to do. To account for the reading of P I make this suggestion.

Elsewhere in the play (229), 681, 1092, 1122-1130, 1227, all three sisters are mentioned, in spite of the fact that Autonoe has a name rather intractable in an iambic senarius. If we suppose Euripides wrote ἢ τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἐστάναι, μητρὸς τ' ἐμῆς, meaning Autonoe and Agave, a scribe wrote Ἀγλαΐης in the margin, another inserted Ἀγλαΐης wrongly instead of ἀδελφῆς in the text, and finally another who was weak in metre omitted τ' to make the statement correct, we can account for P's reading. To return to γε, I submit that it is never really epexegetic. Even when we translate 'that is' or 'I mean,' there is always some limiting force.

G. C. RICHARDS.

THUCYDIDES VI. 34. 7.

PROFESSOR ROSE (*C.R.*, 1928, p. 169) is right in defending the MSS. reading in Thuc. VI. 64. 1 and in his interpretation of οὐχ ὁμοίως. He need not, however, have gone outside Thucydides for his parallels: cf. I. 35. 5 οὐχ ὁμοία ἢ ἀλλοτριώσις; II. 42. 2 καὶ οὐκ ἂν πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἰσόρροπος ὥσπερ τῶνδε ὁ λόγος τῶν ἔργων φαίνεται; VI. 16. 4, 34. 7, 38. 5, and perhaps IV. 85. 7. It is not uncommon to find ἴσος or ὁμοῖος where we must say 'no greater than' or 'only equal to.' Cf. Solon, fr. 23. 23-24 (Diehl); Soph. *O.C.* 810; Hdt. II. 3; Dem. XXIII. 196, XL. 51, LIX. 114; Herodes II. 32 (see Headlam and Knox *ad loc.*);¹ cf. also Ar. *Vesp.* 531 with Starkie's note (and in Latin: Plaut. *Capl.* 302). But I should like to take the opportunity of correcting a mistake I made through ignoring this in a note in *C.R.*, 1920, p. 83, on Thuc. VI. 34. 7, ἰσοκινδύνους ἡγούμενοι. I still believe that ἴσος can only mean 'running equal risks,' 'in equal danger'; but there was no need to alter the text, as I proposed, to ἰσοκίνδυνοι.

A. W. GOMME.

¹ By the way: in Her. II. 5 read not [οὐτῶ] or [μὰ Δία], as Knox in *C.R.*, 1928, 164, but [οὐδ' ὥς] ὑπερέξει.

REVIEWS

SOME VERSE TRANSLATIONS.

1. *Sophocles' King Oedipus*. A version for the modern stage. By W. B. YEATS. Macmillan and Co., 1928. 2s. 6d.
2. *The Persians of Aeschylus*. Translated from the Greek by Rev. C. B. ARMSTRONG, M.A., B.D. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928. 3s. 6d.
3. *The Orestes of Euripides*. Translated into English verse by KENNETH JOHNSTONE. Published by O. T. Jenkins for the Balliol Players. 2s.
4. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΕΦΕΛΑΙ: *The Clouds of Aristophanes*. Adapted for performance by the Oxford University Dramatic Society in 1905 and 1928, with an English version by A. D. GODLEY and C. BAILEY. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.
5. *Aristophanes: The Birds and The Frogs*. Translated into rhymed English verse, with an introductory essay on the form and spirit of Aristophanic Comedy, and an appendix on the interpretation of certain passages in the plays, by MARSHALL MACGREGOR. Edward Arnold and Co., 1927. 12s. 6d.
6. *The Odes of Anacreon*. Translated by ERASTUS RICHARDSON. Yale University Press, 1928. Published in England by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 11s. 6d.

THE most interesting of these translations is Mr. Yeats' translation of the *Oedipus*. The translation was written for the Dublin Players, and was acted by them at the Abbey Theatre on December 7, 1926. An extract from the *New York Times* of December 26, 1926, tells us that the performance was a very great success. We can believe it. Mr. Yeats announces in a short preface his conception of what is required of an acting version of a Greek play. It is made 'for an audience where nobody comes for self-improvement or anything but emotion. . . . The one thing I kept in mind was that a word unfitted for living speech, out of its natural order, or unnecessary to our modern technique, would check

emotion and tire attention.' The chorus could not move about, and was thus considerably handicapped. Mr. Yeats has shortened the choral odes to about half their length in the original. 'The main purpose of the chorus is to preserve the mood while it rests the mind by a change of attention.' With these views in mind, the translator has handled the text with freedom but not with license. The English version is a powerful play; the reader's attention never slips, there is no escape from the sense of taut nerves and quick heart-beats, of something catastrophic in the air and near at hand, of men and women brave and anxious, earnestly pushing forward to their fate. If one may attempt to penetrate some of the secrets of technique, this effect is attained partly by the extreme straightforwardness of the diction, partly by leaving out some of the Greek. In stichomythia sometimes only half of a line is translated. *ἡδᾶτο γὰρ ταῦτ' οὐδέ πω λήξαντ' ἔχει*, says Iocasta (line 733). The English has it: 'Yes: that was the story.' Oedipus replies: *καὶ ποῦ 'σθ' ὁ χώρος οὗτος οὐ τόδ' ἦν πάθος*; 'And where is the place?' To the same end, particles are almost entirely ignored, so that the sentences begin sharply.

One notices that Mr. Yeats stresses, with delicacy, the pervading sense of menace, by a device which Sophocles was not fond of, though Euripides used it. In line 922 Iocasta says in her prayer:

*ὥς νῦν ἀκροῦμεν πάντες ἐκπεληγμένον
κείνον βλέποντες ὡς κυβερνήτην νεῶς.*

This is translated: 'For now we are all afraid, seeing him afraid, even as they who see the helmsman afraid.' So the Herdsman (in line 1165): 'Do not ask any more, master; for the love of God do not ask' (where the *μή* is reduplicated in the Greek). And again in line 1400: 'The blood I spilt, the blood that was my own, my father's blood.'

Sometimes it seems that the omissions entail real loss. For instance, the

question 'Can men rely at all on oracles?' is mainly lost sight of in the English. The choral lines 497-511 are left out, and so is Iocasta's speech of feigned hopefulness in lines 979-983: *εἰκὴ κράτιστον ζῆν*. I suppose this omission can be justified in the light of the purpose of the version, for the question whether oracles tell true may carry no emotional significance to an Irish audience, whereas to the Athenians the thought that Oedipus and Iocasta could escape if it were true that oracles are fallible, must have greatly intensified that dramatic emotion with which, each time you see a tragedy, you hope the end may be averted. So, too, *τῶν τεκόντων* would perhaps not mean for the Greek exactly 'familiar faces'; the actual kinship counted for so much (line 999). But why is the *δεινὸν* (or *καλὸν*) *ὄνειδος* of the scarred ankles (line 1035) softened into an 'old trouble'?

Once it seemed to me Mr. Yeats missed a touch of irony that could carry even to an English-speaking audience a thrill of horror. Iocasta has gone out to her death. Oedipus, nearly crazy with anxiety, loses grip on himself, says he supposes she is upset because she is afraid he may be of servile birth, and breaks out into a hysterical claim to be the child of Chance. 'Her son I am.' *τῆς* is at the beginning of the sentence and of the line, and the actor, pausing at the end of the last sentence, could almost certainly make the audience, for an awful moment, feel that *τῆς* refers not to *τύχῃ*, but to Iocasta. The English version reads: 'That is my origin,' and so the irony is lost.

The abbreviated choruses are very impressive. The tunes to which they were sung are printed at the end of the book.

Mr. Armstrong's translation of the *Persae* reads very well, and has a distinctly Aeschylean flavour. He catches sensitively the transitions from terse narrative to thundering rhetoric, and his choruses suggest the rhythms of the original. The story of the battle, and some of the choral odes (*cf.* lines 568 ff.), seem especially to have the spirit of the Aeschylean Greek in them, though the refrain ('This is the cost of war'), being, I suppose, one of those 'touches . . .

which are not literally in the text' (see Preface, p. 11), seems to me to come nearer to the thoughts of the years A.D. 1914-28 than of the generation that knew Salamis and Plataea. In detail the translation is not always very close to the Greek, as the following lines will show:

*ἐπεὶ γὰρ μέντοι λευκόπῳλος ἡμέρα
πᾶσαν κατέσχευε γαίαν εὐφρογῆς ἰδεῖν,
πρῶτον μὲν ἡχὴ κέλαδος Ἑλλήνων πάρα
μολπῆδ' ἠνέφησεν, ὄρθιον δ' ἄμα
ἀντηλάλαξε νησιώτιδος πέτρας
ἡχώ· φόβος δὲ πᾶσι βαρβάρους παρῆν
γνώμης ἀποσφαλεῖσιν.*

Once more the gleaming chariot of the day
Lit up the hill-tops, and the glassy bay.
Again we saw the foe; and from his fleet
There rose a cry most wonderful and sweet
In the clear morning air, and Echo shrill
Caught up the melody from hill to hill.
Witless we listened, and a nameless fear
Fell on us then.

Mr. Johnstone's rendering of Euripides' *Orestes* is very close to the original; it reads easily, and the blank verse is sometimes reminiscent of Shakespeare. The choruses are not so successful. *Orestes'* speech (lines 640 and following) is a good example of the translator's style. But the version is somewhat uneven, and is spoilt in places by over-literalism. *E.g.* line 696:

For when the people fall to lusty rage,
'Tis like a ravening fire to stamp it out.

Is this English? Or this?—

How worthier of life than death thou art!

And again:

Ere that in truth in these halls I see
Helena's body
Lying all bloody (line 1358);

and—

I vanished, I vanished,
With barbarous boltings (line 1374),

seem to come short of the standard set by other passages in the play. Mr. Johnstone should learn from Mr. Armstrong to number his lines.

The translation of Aristophanes' *Clouds*, by the late Public Orator of Oxford and Mr. Bailey, is as good and funny and scholarly as anybody would expect it to be. The version was made for O.U.D.S., who acted the play in Greek in 1905 and 1928. The Greek and the English are printed in opposite

pages, a device exquisitely adjusted for those who know some Greek but like a little help before, during, or after the performance. The fascinating difficulty of rendering Aristophanes' verbal jokes into English has been greeted by these translators with a cheer; the Turker and the Turkess are entirely convincing in English, and the 'femeal triangle' seems quite too refined. 'Flebitis,' in line 709, gives one a most pleasant sensation of being one up on Aristophanes.

Mr. MacGregor's volume, containing translations of the *Birds* and the *Frogs*, is also an extremely adequate piece of work. He has an introduction of sixteen pages, in which he gives some account of the rise of comedy, and of the work and temperament of Aristophanes in particular, and compares Aristophanes with W. S. Gilbert; and there is an appendix in which certain textual questions and also some topical allusions are interestingly discussed. The translation is full of vigour and humour, and the choruses go with a good swing.

It is interesting to read how Erastus Richardson came to be a translator of the classics. After he was thirteen years old he was only at school for

two terms, and then not consecutively. 'All his life he was a book-keeper in textile mills' at Rhode Island, the preface tells us. All his life, too, he was interested in the things of the mind. After serving in the Civil War he became a member of the Town Council at Woonsocket. He published a *History of Woonsocket*. Brown University gave him the honorary degree of Master of Arts in 1894 for original work in Cylindrical Sections. When he was forty years old he took up the study of Latin, prompted thereto by the desire to achieve 'unfailing accuracy' in words. Later he learnt Greek, and later still Hebrew. He made a number of translations in verse; he 'had that ability to express himself in fluent extemporaneous verse which was almost lost to the world with the passing of the mediaeval minstrel. He frequently delighted his friends by telling stories in rhyme.' The faculty for extemporising verses is a delightful one; but it is not the gift of poetry, and these rhyming versions have lost some of the grace and simplicity of the Anacreontea. They represent the meaning of the Greek with fidelity.

M. R. GLOVER.

A CRETAN STATUETTE IN THE FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM.

A Cretan Statuette in the Fitzwilliam Museum: A Study in Minoan Costume. By A. J. B. WACE. Pp. v + 49; frontispiece, 13 plates, and 2 text figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. 10s. 6d.

THE major part of this book is concerned, as the sub-title indicates, with the costume of the statuette and with that of analogous subjects. No one is more qualified than Mr. Wace to write on the subject he has proposed himself, and the problem dealt with in the chapter on 'Textile Materials and Methods' is peculiarly his own province. The exposition of all the available evidence for Minoan-Mycenean costume, supported by excellent illustrations, enables the reader to appreciate the nuances of the styles of a past civilisation, and to see the place of the Fitzwilliam lady in her world of fashion.

She belongs to a group whose chief

divergence from the prevailing fashion was the wearing of the double-apron. With this group, consisting of three figures in the Candia Museum, the faience Snake Goddess and two Votaries, she has the closest affinities of dress. The flouncing and pleating of her skirt are similar to that of the first Votary, but executed by a more skilful dressmaker; the stiffening of the front of the bodice by 'bones' is found on all four, and on no other female subject except the Boston figure. The Snake Goddess is her closest neighbour in two features: they wear similar head-dresses—a three-tiered 'turban' hat, and not the circlet of the Boston figure and the first Votary; the pattern which borders their apron is the same—a peculiar design of interlacing serpentine lines.

It is thus possible to place the Fitzwilliam lady in a sartorial group, of

which she is, with the exception of her rather ill-fitting belt, the best-dressed member. For the problem of placing her artistically Mr. Wace gives no help. The qualities which he rightly admires—the devoutness of the conception, the noble sympathy of the face—are not characteristic of Minoan-Mycenean art. The normal stance, with the shoulders far back and the waist curved in, is very different from the superb poise and attitude of this statuette.

The eye of the period is primitive: on the Snake Goddess, for example, the eyeball is seen as a complete circle and the eyelids are superficially indicated, while in painting the eye is regularly represented frontally in a profile figure. The treatment of the hair always shows a certain, sometimes a great amount of stylisation. Thus the naturalism of the hair, with its waving tresses, and of the eye, with its drooping meditation, is exceptional. And, in general, the superficial modelling—for example, the musculating of the forearms and of the surface above the shoulder-blades, and the rendering of the facial features—is advanced beyond anything else known of this period.

It has been said that the position of the hands, which must be taken as meant to be touching the breasts—Mr. Wace's attempt to prove the contrary on technical grounds is not convincing—is not Minoan. Nilsson's canon (*The Minoan-Mycenean Religion*, p. 253) seems

to be disproved by four small female images of faience from Knossos: 'They wore the usual flounced costume, and their hands are laid (exceptionally) above the breasts in the attitude of a Mother Goddess' (Evans, *Palace of Minos II.*, p. 702, fig. 440), and by an ivory female figure, wearing Minoan costume, found at the Argive Heraeum, of which a short report says: 'The right arm is missing. But the remains of the fingers show that the hand was laid over the right breast. The left arm was bent at the elbow and held across the body' (*A.J.A.*, XXXII, 1928, p. 533). The Fitzwilliam figure may therefore possibly be regarded as one of a group of a Mother Goddess type.

The Fitzwilliam statuette shows a brilliant advance on the technique of the period to which it is assigned. It has in fact no artistic parallels, unless we include three statuettes whose claim to consideration has not yet been established. Artistically these are manifestly inferior, but in craftsmanship, type, and costume they are similar. Two of them, heard of in 1927, share the Parisian provenance of our statuette; the third, coming from Syria, is made of the same marble. The existence of these pieces, which are closer to the Fitzwilliam figure than any others, is an important fact; until more is known of them, they must be borne in mind as unofficial challengers of the statuette's exceptional position.

P. J. DIXON.

ATHENIAN LAWYERS.

Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens: the Genesis of the Legal Profession. By ROBERT J. BONNER, Ph.D. Pp. xii+276. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1927. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS book describes the various activities of Athenian courts and of those who played a part in them. There is an introductory chapter, somewhat compressed and scrappy, on the Attic orators, followed by two chapters of more technical character on the judiciary and on procedure. The rest of the book is occupied with a description of the courts and their ways. There are

chapters on prosecutors and sycophants, on advocates and speech-writers, on the character of the courts and on Athenian litigiousness, with an account of the career of Apollodorus son of Pasion in illustration. Forensic oratory and the tactics and technicalities of litigation receive attention, and a final chapter contains a brief summary of some famous trials.

It would be unfair in such a work to expect new light on disputed points, and there is little in the account of technical matters that calls for mention. Exposition tends as usual to oust explanation. We have the familiar account of

the specialised courts of homicide, the peculiarities of whose procedure are dismissed with a brief reference to religious conservatism. But there is no discussion of what is the really interesting thing about them—the illustration they furnish of the partial and undeveloped conception of public justice, which both in Greece and Rome continued to leave to private initiative so much of the field covered by the criminal jurisdiction of the modern state. That homicide, which in Rome was from the first a public offence, should have remained a private wrong in Athens, where the religious feeling about bloodshed was so much stronger, is one of the strangest paradoxes in ancient legal history.

The reader who expects a reasoned comparison between ancient and modern conceptions and methods will be disappointed. He will find little beyond a few meagre contrasts in external matters of detail, and some quite general discussion on orthodox lines of the efficiency of ancient juries. The presentation is, in fact, of a popular character throughout, and does not always escape triviality. Amounts of money when mentioned are generally given in dollars. The Areopagus is curiously described as "the senate that sat on Mars' Hill," and what

is more serious, the name Senate is consistently used of the Council of 500. Proportion is not always successfully observed (as in the long and somewhat superficial account of the Sophists and their teaching, which is of doubtful relevance), and there is also a good deal of overlapping and repetition, including a strangely insistent harping on one or two phrases that have caught the author's fancy. A more careful and generous use of commas would have halved the time required to read the book.

A word should be said as to documentation. For the majority of the passages from ancient authors no reference is given, and with three exceptions those there are do no more than indicate the title of the work. On one page where quotations are made from Kennedy's Demosthenes and from a play of Aristophanes, the references for both are to an American work on Sycophancy. Elsewhere Isocrates suffers a like eclipse; and another American work is cited as authority for the judicial suppression of the popular leaders in 404. This is too bad, and not only the classical scholar but the general reader may reasonably complain. Professor Bonner is too modest if he thinks that among the latter there are none who will be moved to seek further for themselves.

E. W. V. CLIFTON.

THE ATTIC CALENDAR.

The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century, based on a study of the detailed accounts of money borrowed by the Athenian State, I.G. I², 324. By BENJAMIN DEAN MERITT. Pp. i + 138; photographs, plates, etc. Published for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens by the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1928.

THE Harvard University Press has earned the gratitude of students of the Attic calendar by the liberality with which it has provided Mr. Meritt with the necessary space for the full exposition of his restoration of the Athenian calendar and of the most important of the inscriptions, *I.G. I², 324* (more familiar to most of us as *I.G. I, 273*), on which it depends. Although

calendar questions cannot be entirely ignored in the restoration of the inscription, the work falls very definitely into two parts, 83 quarto pages being given to the inscription and 43 to the calendar.

As I write I have before me a MS. study, covering six pages foolscap, based largely on the same inscription, which I undertook in 1913 at the request of the late Mr. W. H. Forbes, but which failed to convince that eminent Thucydidean scholar, and which I had intended to include some day in a larger work. In that study I concluded from the inscription in question (1) that the interest mentioned was computed to the close of the last senatorial year of the Panathenaic period, 426-2 B.C.; (2) that the senatorial year was a solar year of

approximately 365½ days, the exact length being variable at the discretion of the government, while each prytany lasted thirty-six or thirty-seven days. From another group of inscriptions, belonging to the years 415-410 B.C., I concluded that the senatorial year at that time began about June 9, though I thought, by what I admit was a miscalculation, that in 410 B.C. the evidence seemed to point to a year beginning on June 5 or earlier. I was of opinion, however, that in the year of Antiphon's speech *περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ* the senatorial year must have begun at a later date, and I therefore concluded that the beginning of the senatorial year must have been shifted between the date of that speech and the year 415 B.C. As the text of *I.G.* I, 273, which I had before me, contained no means of correlating the senatorial with the civil year, I was unable to define the date when the senatorial year began at the time of *I.G.* I, 273.

It is impossible to praise too highly the skill with which Mr. Meritt has restored the text of that mutilated inscription, and it is extremely gratifying to me to find that he not only confirms my two conclusions, but provides a new and valuable correlation between the civil and senatorial calendars in the year 422 B.C. in which we find that the eighth day before the end of Scirophorion was the twentieth day of the tenth prytany. Mr. Meritt's exhaustive knowledge of the inscriptions of this age enables him to supply further correlations between the two calendars, which were unknown to me. Rejecting certain correlations, which in my opinion Mr. Meritt has failed to establish, we now have correlations in 433, 422, 415, 413 or 412, 411, 410, 407, and

406 B.C. It is thus found that in 433 the civil year began 1 day, in 415 42 days, in 412 38 days, in 411 27 days, in 410 46 days, in 407 13 days, in 406 3 days later than in 422 B.C. We can, as Mr. Meritt shows, bring the dates in Antiphon's speech *περὶ τοῦ χορευτοῦ* into harmony with this series of dates by supposing that the speech was delivered in 419 B.C. and that in that year the civil year began 4 days earlier than in 422 B.C. This implies a fluctuation of 50 days in the date of the first of Hecatombaeon, which will surprise nobody who is familiar with the fluctuations of the Babylonian calendar. It also shows that the calendar was running late in the years 415-410 B.C. on which I based my calculation of the beginning of the senatorial year, and I have no hesitation in accepting Mr. Meritt's view that the beginning of the senatorial year ought to fall one lunar month later than I had placed it. This would give July 9 for the years 415-10 B.C. Mr. Meritt gives July 5. But he has without any sufficient reason placed the beginnings of the Attic months four days before the appearance of the crescent moon, and I would recommend students of his book to add four to all his Julian equivalents for Attic dates.

The synchronisms thus found are numerous enough to enable us to define for most years the beginnings both of the civil and of the senatorial year from 434 to 406 B.C. As one who has handled the same problem with far less success, I congratulate Mr. Meritt heartily on his achievement, and I trust that his book will find its way into the hands of every writer on the period of the Peloponnesian War.

J. K. FOTHERINGHAM.

HYPERIDES AND THE KOINE.

Die Sprache des Redners Hyperides in ihren Beziehungen zur Koiné. Von ULRICH POHLE. Pp. 140. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1928. M. 4.50.

THE fourth century marks an important epoch in the history of the Greek language. We know, unfortunately, little about the spoken language of the Athe-

nian people, though we have no doubt that it departed very far from the austere Atticism of the speeches of Pericles as represented by Thucydides. There are, however, many indications that during the period in question language was in the melting-pot, and that writers of various classes—historians, poets, and

orators—could not fail to be influenced by the gradual merging of the Attic dialect into the *κοινή* of the Hellenistic age.

Herr Pohle, in his monograph on the language of Hyperides, has made a definite contribution to our knowledge of the deterioration of Attic. Ancient grammarians, such as Hermogenes, Phrynichus, and Pollux, had called attention to the orator's use of un-Attic words; Pohle discusses this characteristic under various headings.

The section dealing with spelling rests on foundations which are not secure at every corner, for apart from the observations of grammarians, who are more or less to be trusted, we must rely in most cases on MS. evidence, and this, though the papyrus fragments of Hyperides are very old, is not always to be trusted.

On the other hand, for the authenticity of curious word-forms, e.g., *ῥαδιώτερος*

and *ἀγαθέστατος*, we are more inclined to trust the MSS., especially if supported by grammarians' evidence.

The section dealing with vocabulary is by far the most important in the present work; there is, for instance, a long list of un-Attic words which occur first in Hyperides, followed by other lists of rare words used by the orator, carefully classified according to their sources. These lists appear to be very complete.

The investigation of the syntax gives little but negative results; thus, *ὅπως ἂν* with the optative is rare; most uses of the moods and tenses are normal, and in the use of prepositions, except that Hyperides appears not to have used *ἀμφί* and *ἀνά* in his extant works, there is little divergence from the normal. Still, the labour spent on this section is not wasted, for it will provide useful material for future work.

J. F. DOBSON.

SOCRATIC LETTERS.

Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker.

VON LISELOTTE KÖHLER. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XX., Heft II.) Pp. 141. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928. Geheftet, M. 10.50; gebunden, M. 12.50. This little volume, originally begun as an Academic 'dissertation,' gives us a text of the so-called 'Socratic epistles' (with the exception of Nos. 25 and 26 of Orelli's edition), an *apparatus* recording the readings of the three chief MSS.—those of Vat. 64 are especially welcome—with the conjectures of the *docti*, a German version, and a brief commentary. There is, of course, no intention of rehabilitating this, mostly worthless, collection, which is reasonably regarded as a production of the 'later sophistic,' though the author seems inclined to regard the interesting letter 28 (Orelli's 30), in which Speusippus argues to Philip of Macedon that his real friend is Codrin (Plato), not Short (Isocrates), and recommends a certain Antipater ('probably not the well-known regent'), as founded on a genuine document.

I own I should have desired a rather fuller discussion of the difficulties

created by one's uneasy suspicion that the writer meant his Antipater for the 'regent' after all, and by some of the other allusions (e.g., the mention of Theopompus as present with the Macedonian court), though I would not suggest that Miss Köhler is wrong in her conclusion.

The work is creditably done in its various departments, but, to my mind, too juvenile to be definitive. Thus more than once I think the editor's rewriting of the text actually corrupts sound readings of the MSS. Thus in 6, at p. 16, 26, the text of PG οἱ τε πλησίον ἀποδέχεσθαι αὐτοὺς seems to me to be perfectly correct, and to be followed in Miss Köhler's own translation; I cannot get any suitable sense from her οὔτε πλείον ἀποδέχεσθαι ἄλλους. In the same letter, 18, 13, the sound πατρικὴν ἅμα πολιτικὴ παρρησίαν ἄγων is wantonly corrupted by writing παρρησίᾳ. At 19, 2-3, I understand exactly what the MSS. mean by παλαιούμενα γὰρ νέα γίγνεται καὶ πρὸς γῆρας μᾶλλον ἀναθεωρεῖσθαι φιλεῖ (marked as corrupt). The substitution, made with a (?) after Howald, of ἐννοα for νέα, seems to me to destroy

the sense, and the insertion of a <τὸ> before γήρας to deprave the idiom. ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὰ πατήρ at 19, 5 is an echo of ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ in *Tim.* 37c, 7, and this should have kept the editor from obelising πατήρ. In 9, at 23, 15, on the other hand, ἀμείνω τοῦ χρημάτων is kept, and the translation shows that this is supposed to be Greek for 'better than anything.' (Perhaps the τοῦ is a printer's error for του, but, even so, are the words tolerable? Should we write χείματος?) At 27, 13 (in 14), the MS. προσίεναι τούτοις τοῖς πράγμασιν is surely unexceptionable; not so the editor's <ἐν> τούτοις τοῖς πρ. In 21, at 37, 2, the correct MS. Ἀπολλόδαωρος ὁ μαλακός is corrupted by writing ὁ μανικός on the strength of Plat. *Symp.* 173d, 8 (where μαλακός is actually the reading of B and of the 'first hand' in TW). The translation is, in general, a respectable piece of work, but, like other things of the kind, has its lapses. Thus the words of *Ep.* 13, ὁμολογῶν εὐλόγως ἐρωτᾶν Προδίκον, could not possibly mean 'indem du behauptest, den Prodikos verständig zur Rede zu stellen,' but only as the context requires,

'though you confess that P. argues reasonably.' The notes have been carefully put together and will be found both interesting and useful, though there is room for considerable additions. E.g., in *Ep.* 23 the allusion to a conversation ἐν τῷ κήπῳ should have been marked as taken from Plat. *Ep.* III. 319a, VII. 347a, 348c. On *Ep.* 17, it should have been noted that the writer actually talks of οἱ ἐνδεκα at Athens as if they were a court of law, saying that Socrates τοῖς ἐνδεκα δόξαν ἀνηρέθη. This means that he recollected, but misunderstood, *Phaedo* 85b, 9, ἕως ἂν Ἀθηναίων ἐώσιν ἄνδρες ἐνδεκα. In the useful note to the same *Epistle* on the literary treatment of the theme of the 'young foreigner' who comes to visit Socrates, the starting-point of the *Motiv*, the statement of Aeschines, preserved by Diogenes, that Aristippus was brought to Athens κατὰ κλέος Σωκράτους, is strangely overlooked. On *Ep.* 21, notice should have been taken of the legend that Aeschines acquired the 'papers' of Socrates from his widow.

A. E. TAYLOR.

HELLAS THE FORERUNNER.

Hellas the Forerunner. Vol. II.: The Glory Fades. By H. W. HOUSEHOLD. Pp. 184; 3 maps. London: Dent and Sons, 1928. 3s. 6d. net.

THE first thirty-seven pages of this book are taken up with the New Learning and the Drama (plentifully sprinkled with quotations from Livingstone and Gilbert Murray, and from the latter's Euripides); the next hundred with the Peloponnesian War (mostly quotations of well-worn passages in Thucydides). That is three-quarters of the book gone. Then sixteen pages on Socrates, and fourteen on the *Republic*—or rather, on a small section of it—the communistic system of the Guardians, with the gibes of Aristophanes and the criticisms of Aristotle added. 'From Aegospotami to Alexander' is given seven pages. One cannot help feeling that, even if the Peloponnesian War is the sole and sufficient cause of the decline, a narrative of that decline over the fourth and third

centuries (shall we say?) demands more space than Mr. Household allows; more especially, one would have thought, as his chief object appears to be to draw a parallel and point a moral to modern England—our glory began to fade when the *Mayflower* left for America, and it will fade (what with our unemployed) the more quickly if we listen to Bolsheviks, the less quickly if we don't. This, together with a prophecy on the future of America, is summed up in the last chapter ('Hellenism, an Empire of the Mind,' seven pages), which also contains some lists of English words borrowed from Greek (including several from Cretan, and *cynema*—'with the soft c and shortened z, both displeasing to a scholar's ear': but what a scholarly y). Among the noticeable statements in the book are—Pythagoras discovered the heliocentric theory (p. 4); comedy was produced at a September festival (p. 29; cf. pp. 31, 76); Anytus was 'as

honest as the day'; Socrates did not drink; 'then [*i.e.*, after Leuctra and the independence of Messene] Athens—oh, the pity of it!—made another bid for leadership, and recovered lost ground between the Hellespont and the Euxine, till Thebes created a navy and dispatched Epaminondas to the Propontis to stay her progress; whereupon that

weathercock Byzantium revolted, and the Athenian confederacy dissolved.' 'The Peloponnesian War had its origin, like so many wars, in rivalry for trade. There was not enough of a good thing to go round. . . . Athens could not afford to be excluded permanently from the Italian and Sicilian trade; she had too many unemployed already,' etc.

A. W. GOMME.

THE BUDÉ HERONDAS.

Hérondas, Mimes. Texte établi par J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN, Litt. D., et traduit par LOUIS LALOY, Docteur ès Lettres. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928.

THE text of this edition was originally drawn up by Dr. Nairn, and revised by Messrs. Bell and Milne of the British Museum. One—and only one—new and good reading they contributed—at I. 86: for Mr. Milne's admirable interpretation of the traces at VII. 70 was pitchforked into this edition without the least effort at acknowledgment or translation. For the rest, their task was probably unfamiliar; the stables may have been Augean; but the fact remains that five letters of the text have disappeared at VIII. 31 and three at IX. 8: while at VIII. 47, as a sort of make-weight, we are offered five wholly imaginary letters. There are gross errors at I. 17, 81, 82; II. 5, 6; VII. 10, 11, 108; VIII. 11, 19, 22, 23, 39, 66; etc.

New corrections or interpretations of the text are hard to find. In this connection W. G. Headlam wrote (C.R. XVIII. 263) of Dr. Nairn's edition of Herod(a)s 'The actual gain accruing is: in I. 82 Mr. Nairn has restored *οὐ παραλλάττειν*.' This suggestion Dr. Nairn has now creditably, if somewhat half-heartedly, withdrawn; so that, if Headlam was right—and it was a habit of Headlam's—Dr. Nairn's services to the text and interpretation of Herodes—apart from the errors noticed above—now present a *tabula rasa*. It is true that he appears to claim original suggestions at VIII. 8 and II. 15; but of these the first was printed in the Cambridge edition, was adopted (with acknowledgments) by Herzog, and has drawn forth cascades of frothy abuse from

Terzaghi and Vogliano. The second suggestion appears in the Cambridge edition, whence it was taken by Mr. J. M. Edmonds (without acknowledgments) in the precise form in which Dr. Nairn prints it.

Professor Mazon's unhappy suggestion at II. 81 would have been impossible had he read Dr. Headlam's note. With IV. 94, where I believe the reading of the first hand to be substantially sound, I hope to deal elsewhere; and I do not propose to discuss M. Reinach's Tardieu-esque calculations of the value of Greek coins mentioned in Herodes.

The body of the work appears to be due to M. Laloy, who contributes the translation and a long introduction skirting amiably round several topics. But his ignorance is astounding. He quotes as by Hipponax two fragments, one of which is attributed elsewhere in a Berlin papyrus and is metrically impossible, while the other is disfigured by an incorrigible Atticism. His treatment of the Heidelberg choliambic papyrus is unsound, and somewhat insulting to the memory of a great and cautious scholar. The London papyrus, as read by Mr. Milne, he ignores. He reckons Callimachus' choliambi at fifty instead of one hundred and fifty. But there are far deeper abysses. From a note on p. 20 it is tragically evident that, when the savants of the Seine speculate on the meliambos of Cercidas, they steer their course, not by the beacon of the splendid poems from Oxyrhynchus, but by the flickering will-o'-the-wisp of eight verses misquoted by Diogenes Laertius. On p. 34 he asserts that I have 'constaté' that Herodes and Hipponax wrote 'choliambes plus libres' than those of Phoenix and Callimachus, and

hints that the result comes from calculations of spondees in the fifth foot and hiatus. You would not have guessed that in fact I had proposed an acid test superior to such calculations, which are powerless in face of corrupt MSS. and the tricky memory of a Tzetzes; and that this test brought out Hipponax and Callimachus on one side and Phoenix and Herodes on the other. In fact he has studied Hipponax so little that he says (following Dr. Nairn) 'Certains mots sont empruntés à Hipponax: beaucoup d'expressions rappellent Aristophane,' without the quite necessary caveat that antiquity accused Aristophanes of barefaced plagiarism from Hipponax. Nor can M. Laloy be held really to have read Herodes: on p. 34 we meet an assertion so bewildering in its obtuseness that we gasp and gasp again. 'Le deuxième et le quatrième mime se passent dans l'île de Cos. Pour tous les autres, l'auteur ne donne aucune indication.' What of the *κάθοδος τῆς Μίσσης*, the Gerenia, the *συννοικίη* of Hermodorus, the marriage of the Artacene, and other details whose very precision renders them, for us, obscure?

Ignorance of modern discoveries, indifference to metre, a study of Herodes, his predecessors and contemporaries that it would be flattering to call superficial, unwillingness to read English or Italian and failure to understand German—all these might not constitute a fatal handicap to a popular edition of Herodes. Where M. Laloy really fails is in his knowledge of elementary Greek. He is capable of translating *νάβυστρα* as 'tas d'abruties' and *οὐλη τῇ βατηρίῃ* as 'de mon bâton dru.' Facility of his sort has its blissful side: what others had deemed mountains become molehills: the crooked paths are straight and the rough places plain. If you are comfortably ignorant of the meaning of *ὁ ἡ τό* you can easily translate the last verse of Mime VII. Often, however,

M. Laloy's translation clearly derives from other sources than the text, as the curious may see at XII. 5. Of fact itself M. Laloy has no grasp; for example on VIII. 37 he says that 'l'allusion à Ulysse est obscure'; yet I doubt if any theory has received so striking a confirmation as that which I formed before *δῶρον* appeared in this verse. The critical apparatus is very faulty. The reading of *μέτοικος* in II. 8 is due to F. D., not to Crusius, who read *μέρος τι*. At VIII. 31 *ὅμοις*, now the reading of the papyrus, was conjectured by Mekler. M. Laloy's textual criticism is beneath contempt. He does not see that from the reading in VIII.

32 (*εστικτο*) not only is *στικτῆς* certain in VIII. 30, but *εστειπτο* and the rest of v. 32, guessed long before the fragments were assembled, are certain as many other verses which we can read in the papyrus are uncertain. Yet in many cases (e.g., I. 17, 36; VII. 13, 14, 15, 26, 44; etc.) M. Laloy prints conjectures which have received no shadow of proof or have actually been disproved. A final handicap from which our editor appears to suffer is a lack of acquaintance with French classics. The translation is flat and flabby. What an admirable model Rabelais would have been! Yet M. Laloy's translation of VIII. 13 (as restored) leaves us doubting whether he has read further than twelve chapters of *Gargantua*.

Herodes was not a great author; yet he deserves something better than the attention of a motley variety of *artistes*, of whom Mr. Milne alone has rendered constant, laborious, or fruitful service to his interpretation, and I turn with relief to Herzog's *Herondas*, profoundly as I disagree with his conclusions. It is impossible to edit an author without single and persistent study of all relevant considerations.

A. D. KNOX.

INDOGERMAN GRAMMAR.

Indogermanische Grammatik. HERMANN HIRT. Heidelberg: Winter. VOLUME II. of this work, a second edition of the author's *Ablaut*, appeared

in 1921 under the title *Der Indogermanische Vocalismus*; I. *Einleitung*. I. *Etymologie*, II. *Konsonantismus*, and III. *Das Nomen*, appeared in 1927, and IV.

Doppelung Zusammensetzung Verbum in 1928. It is apparent that the original plan has been modified, for the *Akzentlehre* promised in 1921 as one of four volumes has not yet appeared, and there are references in IV. to a forthcoming *Syntax*.

To write a grammar of a language of which we know nothing except by inference is a formidable task. Dr. Hirt knows that a grammar of, say, Plautine Latin based exclusively on the results of a comparison of the modern Romance languages would be defective, but is, nevertheless, confident that this grammar of Indogermanic is 'ein recht wirkliches Gebilde,' I. 96 f. Most readers will probably find that this is going too far. A detailed examination of Dr. Hirt's book would reveal in every paragraph precarious etymologies and historical assumptions for which there are no substantial grounds. In Vol. I., 126 f., there is a discussion of a 'rhetorical peculiarity of Idg. poetry,' the peculiarity being that when there is a succession of three or four proper names, the third or fourth is provided with an epithet. A number of examples from Homer are given, four from Sanskrit Epic, and a like number from early Germanic verse. Finally, the author appears to think that he strengthens his case by giving as an example from Latin *Erebumque Chaosque terminumque* (sic) *Hecaten*. The device is admirably illustrated in the refrain of 'Widdicombe Fair,' and to claim Indogermanic origin for it does injustice to the ingenuity of later craftsmen. It should be mentioned, in this connection, that Dr. Hirt credits the undivided Indogermans with a cultural development sufficiently advanced to include several deities known to Indogermanic-speaking peoples of historical times. The notorious equation *Mars, Māvors = Marut, Marutas* is again resurrected, I. 195, without a word of warning that the etymology is improbable because the two words differ entirely in meaning, can be connected phonetically only by extreme violence, and because there is no reason to suppose that Mars and the Marutas are not independent Italian and Indian creations. The same objections will always apply to most of the identi-

fications on p. 196, some of which, as that of Apollo with Sanskrit *saparyás*, can only be described as puerile.

One outstanding weakness of this Grammar is the assumption throughout that phenomena which may well be due to factors known in the history of the separate languages must date from the common language. A typical example of this appears on I. 147, where, from the comparison of Lat. *vīrus* n., Gk. *íos* m., Skt. *vīśam* n., the conclusion is drawn that the Idg. form must have been *vīśos*, a neuter -o stem. But an essential step in the argument was a demonstration that substantives do not change their gender in the history of the individual languages; and that would have been difficult.

The analysis of grammatical forms, largely by the assumption of 'determinatives,' naturally cannot be controlled, and is for that reason of no value whatever. Nothing is gained by explaining, for example, the acc. sg. and pl. of -o stems as due to the addition of the pronouns *me* and **nes*; or by making the -i of the gen. sg. of -o stems in Latin and Celtic identical with the *i* of the Skt. nom. dual *akṣi*. Occasionally there are signs of confusion in the author's mind. The gen. sg. *ποδός* is said, III. 46, to have the termination -s, -o- belonging to the stem; but on the next page it is said that the gen. termination -os may have originated in the consonant stems such as *ποδός*.

The attempt to explain finite verbal forms as nominal is not very convincing. The 3. dual -itas is, IV. 104, identified with the verbal adj. in -tos, but why a nom. sg. should be singled out to serve for dual does not appear. The termination of the Lat. perf. 1 sg. *ēgī* is identified with that of the pass. infin. *agī*, IV. 159. The Skt. 1. sg. pres. med. -ē is explained in the same way. These identifications, like hundreds of others to which Dr. Hirt commits himself, are simply guesses, most of them intrinsically improbable, and all of them incapable of confirmation. When a language, or a number of languages, cognate with Indogermanic shall have been discovered and studied, the analysis of Indogermanic forms can begin; in the meantime we must be content with

the humbler task of establishing their existence, and that task requires more caution and restraint than the brilliant

ingenuity of Dr. Hirt is likely to tolerate.

J. FRASER.

MACEDONIAN IMPERIALISM.

Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenisation of the East. By PIERRE JOUGUET. Translated by M. R. Dobie. Pp. xx + 440; 7 plates, 4 maps and a plan. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1928. 21s.

THIS volume of *The History of Civilisation*, a translation of Professor Jouguet's book of 1926, may be warmly welcomed, for general works on Hellenism are not too plentiful in English, and this one certainly merits an enlarged circle of readers. The only alterations from the original are a few additional notes by Jouguet, and references by the translator to other volumes of the series and to Botti's plan of Alexandria (p. 279). The first three parts of the work treat the history proper from the accession of Alexander, with some general chapters, while the fourth part deals with the Hellenisation of Egypt and Asia; the book also contains maps of Asia, the Aegean, Egypt, and the Seleucid settlements, a table of dynasties, bibliography, and index. It thus gives a comprehensive view of one side of the Hellenistic period; the other side—art, literature, religion, etc.—is not included in the plan. The treatment of the history proper gave me a certain sense of perfunctoriness; doubtless it will give the general reader a fair idea of the time, but it will hardly help scholars much; it is too often conventional, occasionally with the conventions of a past day. Unfortunately, too, the author knows little of English work—not even Mr. Sidney Smith's *Babylonian Historical Texts*, or, for India, Vincent Smith's *History* or *The Cambridge History of India*, to cite only the most obvious things. But the general chapters are on quite a different level. The two on Alexander's empire are about as good as anything I have read; indeed one section (*Alexander's Work*, p. 109), taken up again in the *Conclusion*, is most striking, and contains much food for thought.

The author, who believes in Alexander's divine world-kingdom, has a feeling for his greatness, and a clear sense of the conflict between town and country; I think however that, as he says Persians worshipped him (p. 76), he should have warned the reader that this is a highly contentious question. In the later period, while happily justice is done to the abilities of Antigonos I., it is again the general sections (pp. 126, 169) which stand out.

But probably the best of the book is in part four, which comprises nearly half of it: four chapters on Ptolemaic Egypt, and one on everything in Asia. The author knows this proportion is not ideal, but pleads the compulsion of the extant information; probably this is our gain, for in Egypt Jouguet is on his own ground. Seleucid Asia is an excellent sketch, though too brief; but of Egypt—life, government, organisation, industry, Hellenisation—we have a picture which could hardly be bettered. Outstanding sections are those on king-worship and particularly the native worship of the Ptolemies (though the sister-marriage of Ptolemy II. was not, I think, a 'concession to native ideas'), and on Egyptian industries; while the treatment of the question, Was the Empire for offence or defence? (Jouguet rightly favours the former) is thoroughly good. Some small corrections may be needed about the Red Sea (pp. 274 ff.), and had Egyptians really reared all their children (p. 282) they must have flooded the Nearer East; otherwise my chief comment on these masterly chapters is that I would gladly have given some of the political history to make room for a fuller account of (say) the oil-monopoly, with figures, and of the vine and wine taxes.

The translation, which generally runs easily, should find many readers. In view of a second edition, it may be helpful to indicate some points which require correction: a few faulty trans-

lations,¹ and some mistakes in words and names,² some of them slips in the

¹ P. 24, l. 4, 'plusieurs' here is not 'several.' 28, le *prophète* is hardly 'a Prophet.' 89, 'we seem to see,' implies that the author believes it (he does not); 'on croit voir' is here 'some people think that they see.' 120, Roxane's 'enfant' becomes 'son,' with sad results. 142, 'in the memory of' means something different; 'in' should be 'before.' 146, 'at least if he was to rule it'; what is 'it'? The French is quite different. 206, 'les alliés' is not here 'their allies,' and 'Locrians and Orientals' should be 'Eastern Locrians.' 364, 'the priestly noble' does not represent *prêtre*—seigneur.

² Require altering: 30, 6, 'queens' to 'the queens'; 27, Halys to Euphrates; 38, Memnon to Menon; 71, accessible to inaccessible; 98, 'head' of the statue to 'hand'; 131, Arrhabeus to Arrhidaeus; 160, Cyrus to Curus or Koros; 198, Phthias to Phthia; 209, West to

original. I have also noted a few renderings which are hardly English;³ trifles perhaps, but they irritate readers. And I fancy that 'eminent right,' used throughout to translate 'le droit éminent (du roi),' will, whether correct or not, puzzle more people than myself.

W. W. TARN.

East; 211, Ford to Bridge; 244, 'Stoic' Straton to 'Peripatetic'; *ib.*, five-yearly to four-yearly; 247, Phaselis to Caunos; 266, laudandum to ladanum; 365, 'to' the trade-routes to 'for'; *ib.*, Deodamas to Demodamas; 379, 'son' Jonathan to 'brother'; 383, Mylias to Milyas; 391, Hierocles to Heliocles.

³ *E.g.*, 11, the properly Macedonian infantry; 35, delayed in arriving; 53, from where they knew that; 136, the splitting Empire; 148, at long last (enfin); 173, sums in kind (sommés en nature); 176, dominated in; 272 (does one 'sophisticate' frankincense?).

THE GREEK QUESTIONS OF PLUTARCH.

The Greek Questions of Plutarch. With a new Translation and a Commentary. By W. R. HALLIDAY. Pp. 233. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. 15s.

THE longest and most important part of this book consists of notes to Plutarch's questions and answers. As the questions mostly relate to obscure points in the religious ritual or the constitutional antiquities of Greek city-states, and the answers are a strange medley of sound tradition and mythology-made-while-you-wait, both alike require a good deal of explanation; and the present commentary exactly meets the case. Mr. Halliday has brought to his task the three most requisite qualifications—a wide knowledge of primitive culture in general, a keen eye for the boundary between genuine folk-memory and aetiological guesswork, and, above all, great courage in cultivating the *ars nesciendi*. As instances of his method we might quote his notes on qns. 9 and 12, in which he elucidates the early history of Apollo and the Delphic oracle; qn. 24, where he illustrates Greek mourning customs; qn. 37, in which he traces the development of the Amazon legend. But favourable examples will be found under almost every heading.

A few remarks on points of detail suggest themselves:

Qn. 2 (on the *φυλακτής* or policeman-gaoler of Cumae).—In addition to the Eleven at Athens, whom Mr. Halliday adduces as a parallel, we might quote the *φυλακῖται* who bulk so largely in the papyri of Ptolemaic Egypt.

Qn. 8.—Is not *ὁ θεσμοφυλάκιος νόμος* the law *for*, not *of*, the 'Thesmophylaces'? Cf. *ὁ τελωνικός νόμος*.

Qn. 29 (on the *πωλητής* of Epidamnus).—To say that 'the Greek trader seems *never* to have penetrated into the interior' rather overshoots the mark. Evidence of such penetration lies at hand precisely in the Balkans (cf. Pârvan's *Dacia*, passim, and *De Mirab. Auscultationibus*, ch. 104).

Qn. 30.—To the instances of mixed courts of arbitration here quoted we may add 'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1918-19, p. 151 ff. (eleven cities of the Achaean League), and *Klio*, vol. 18, p. 261 (various towns of the Aetolian League).

Qn. 53 ('why was it the custom among the Cnossians *for* those who borrowed money to snatch the cash?')—Could this be a fictitious theft, with a view to circumventing a law in restraint of usury? The ordinary method of invasion is by a fictitious sale; but a fictitious theft (which the borrower

would compound on the date of repayment) seems a possible alternative.

Lastly, in regard to Plutarch's sources, Mr. Halliday suggests that Aristotle's *Πολιτεῖαι* were freely used by him. For constitutional antiquities no better source could be imagined; but did Aristotle take much interest in problems of religious ritual? Philochorus and

his school would seem to be indicated here.

But to sum up. The present volume should become something more than a standard edition of a peculiarly difficult Greek treatise: it should, in addition, make an admirable textbook for teaching methods of research in Greek religion and folklore.

M. CARY.

CORPUS CAESARIANUM.

C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii. Edidit ALFREDUS KLOTZ. Vol. III. *Commentarii Belli Alexandrini, Belli Africi, Belli Hispaniensis*. Accedunt *C. Iuli Caesaris et A. Hirtii fragmenta*. Pp. xvi + 248, 1 plan. Leipzig: Teubner, 1927. Paper, M. 5.60; cloth, M. 6.80.

WITH this volume Klotz brings to an end his text of the *corpus Caesarianum*. In an interesting preface, after illustrating by different categories of mistakes the common origin of all the MSS. containing these books, he notes that the π family not infrequently preserve a corrupt reading of the archetype where the others have introduced wilful changes. His most important point is the development of a suggestion already tentatively advanced in his *B.C.* preface, p. viii f. Adducing a large number of instances in which W_p in these books just as in the *B.C.* offer the true reading as against $\sigma\pi$, he argues that these are due not to conjecture but to a source independent of our archetype. Where again two different readings are in W_p , he holds that the one which agrees with $\sigma\pi$ came from our archetype, the other from this second source. If this theory be sound it will give us for the *B.C.* and the three later commentaries a small, though very small, compensation for the absence of the double tradition that is at our disposal for the *B.G.* (Kalinka has rejected it, preferring to explain such cases as partly corrections by copyists or editors, partly double readings of the archetype. One would expect, however, to find π showing traces, or clearer traces, of these double readings.) But serious difficulty seems to be offered by the agreement of all MSS. as regards lacunae and other mistakes. If

W_p had access to another tradition, why, for example, do they not fill up the obvious gaps? Does Klotz think that the second source, though right at some points where our archetype was wrong, was deficient also in the same gaps? This wanted elucidation. Nevertheless, Klotz's idea is of great interest, may be capable of fruitful exploitation, and at any rate merits further investigation. It is noteworthy that he himself does not on the strength of his hypothesis give precedence to W_p . Thus, to take but two examples, even when they are reinforced by V , he rejects at *B.Al.* 66. 5 their *inceptum* (Kübler) in favour of *coeptum* (so *S*, *ceptum* *T*), and at *B.Afr.* 85. 1 their *parent* (Wölflin) in favour of *parerent*, dett. and Oudendorp, in this latter case showing much less than his usual discretion. He regards Hirtius as the author of the *B.Al.* as of *B.G.* VIII., but has abandoned his belief that *B.G.* VIII. praef. 2 implies the actual existence of commentaries extending *usque ad exitum vitae Caesaris*.

The treatment of the text is marked by common sense and the restraint called for in these writings. The proportion of emendations admitted into the *B.Al.* and *B.Afr.*, as compared with Kübler's edition, is 3 : 5. He adopts 5 of Kübler's changes in the *B.Al.* and 10 of Wölflin's in the *B.Afr.* His own corrections in these books amount to only 22 (or really 21, for *inter* at *B.Afr.* 83. 1 is Wölflin's), the only violent one being *Squillo* for *Q. Sestio* at *B.Al.* 55. 5 and the majority being small modifications of MSS. readings or previous suggestions. At *B.Al.* 49. 2 he reads *quaestuis* following π *quaestius*, SW_p having *quaestus*. The readings of the *deteriores* are eschewed at the following

passages where Kübler and Wölflin accept them: *B.Al.* 2. 5 *confecerant*, *B.Afr.* 10. 3 *solacii . . . auxilii*, 68. 1 *XIV*, 75. 1 *progressus*, where he keeps *processus* ω. On the other hand, he follows them where they seem right but are disbelieved by Kübler, at *B.Al.* 48. 1 *dissimulabant*, and less certainly at 68. 1 *defectionem*. It is to be regretted that Klotz did not check or have checked MSS. like S and V at points where their readings are still doubtful. An advance is marked by the attribution of considerable weight to σ (S + L, the latter as vouched for by Landgraf and du Pontet). Thus for the *B.Al.* he adopts σ against β where Kübler follows β or a family of β: 7. 2 *descisse* (so S, β *descivisse*), 37. 2 *cum vereretur* (π *vereretur*, Wp *veritus*), 37. 3 *Nicopolin* (so S, β -im), 42. 2 *exercitum alendum* (Uπ -um-os, WR -us-os), 56. 4 *colonisque* (so S, β -isque), 57. 3 *iis* (WpT *is*, V *his*), 60. 5 *educunt* (β *educit*, V having *du-*), 61. 6 *usu* (β *usui*); and he thinks also that σ is perhaps right at 11. 1 *longeque* (β *longe*), 17. 4 *qua* (so S, β *quo*). A remarkable preference is seen in *B.Afr.* 91. 4, where a long sentence closes with the words *atque ad villam suam cum M. Petreio paucisque equitibus confert se*. So S: β has *confert* and D² and δ (two Dresden manuscripts) *se confert*, which is adopted by Wölflin. Noticeable cases of conservatism, where Kübler and Wölflin abandoned ω, are: *B.Al.* 17. 4 *pariter*, 27. 1 *medium*, 42. 3 *Iadestinorum*, 58. 3 *fatebantur*, 68. 1 *deinde*, *B.Afr.* 17. 1 *tenderet*, 19. 3 *Iubam* (though he dallies with *Labienum* and *Scipionem*), 38. 1 *castellaque*, 51. 5 *utebantur*, 56. 3 *locum*, 74. 1 *administraturos*, 92. 4 *perveniunt*, 97. 1 *ibique*. The majority of these even du Pontet gives up.

After holding his hand in the *B.Al.* and *B.Afr.* it might at first sight appear that he has let himself go in the *B.Hisp.* Differing from Kübler at over 200 places he has introduced over 50 innovations. But a large proportion of these are very slight modifications, or the marking of lacunae, or insertions in agreed gaps. His additions Klotz himself would regard as merely provisional. Actually the same conservative policy is maintained (*nimis* in 8. 2 is an unfortunate exception). Kübler had incorporated 22 of Mommsen's suggestions and men-

tioned 41 others; Klotz admits only the certain *impedita* in 7. 3 and *Lusitanis* in 38. 3 and the highly probable *et secunda* in 7. 4 (not adopted by Kübler), reducing the 'mentions' to 5. Of Kübler's own improvements he takes over 6 and records also the suggestion at 41. 2. One or two others (e.g., 32. 6 *parandum Carteiam* and 34. 2 *dissentire*) deserved citation. The following are the most noticeable of Klotz's emendations: 3. 5 *viasque*, 22. 3 *Bursavone*, 7. x vii, 23. 4 *integer regressus*, 25. 2 *insequendi*, 41. 3 *adiutus*. At several of the places where Klotz has marked lacunae the text may be as probably corrected by changes. The first of the lacunae marked in 32. 2 appears doubtful; odd though the expression is, it is well within the incapacity of this writer. Without repeating Kübler's verdict (*Latine magis balbutiebat quam loquebatur*), Klotz fancies that he could write at 3. 8 *magna pars hominum qui in his castris fuisset!* He finds no difficulty consequently in leaving him such Latin as is found at 2. 1 *iter ante*; 9. 1; 12. 5, 6 (though something is wrong here at least); 29. 3 *id quod*; 31. 2 *erat*; 41. 1; 42. 4 *et civiumque* (cf. also *B.Afr.* 33. 1 *civitate libera et immunique*), and in saddling him at 18. 6 with *transfuge—nuntiaruntque*. (Cf. also the suggestion at *B.Al.* 3. 1 *ingeniosi—et acutissimi*.)

The fragments are set out more clearly than in Kübler. The following main differences may be noted. The 'leges,' 'senatus consulta' and 'decreta' are omitted. He gives 'testimonia' on Caesar's oratorical style. He omits references to the Catilinarian speech and the addresses to troops, given in Dio, Appian, and Suetonius, regarding the former as not having been published and the latter as fictitious. Certain fragments of the *de Analogia*, assigned by Kübler to one or other of the books, are properly marked 'incertorum librorum.' The letters are grouped, not chronologically as in Kübler, but in the three corpora indicated by Suetonius. This is an improvement. Klotz rightly suppresses the purely military messages recorded in the commentaries and included by Kübler, but he is somewhat arbitrary in limiting his references to such letters only as he believes to have been

certainly or probably published. He says nothing of the *γράφματα* mentioned in Plut. *Pomp.* 56, yet Caesar would surely retain a copy and be likely to include it in the published edition. And where certainty is not possible, it would have been safer to refer also to such passages as Plut. *Crass.* 14, Cic. *ad Att.* IV. 16. 7, XI. 7. 2, *ad Q. fr.* III. 1. 20. The omission of a reference to Cic. *Phil.* XII. 9 for Hirtius's despatches seems curious. In Plut. *Caes.* 50 he adopts Cichorius's *Μάριον* (recipient of the *veni vidi vici* letter), and at *B.Afr.* 89. 5 his *Ocellae*.

The list of corrigenda (p. xvi) might have been substantially increased. Thus from the *B.Hisp.* alone: 1. 1 *Caesar* is for *Caesaris* in an addition of Klotz's own; 11. 2 cr. app. *eo dieq.* V *eoque die* V, the second V for W; 13. 6 *quia* for *quin*; 16. 2 *nocta* for *nocte*; 18. 7 *tempori* for *tempore*; 28. 3 *oppido* for *oppidi*; 41. 2 *caede* is omitted. There are inexcusable slips in the *Fragmenta* section on pp. 201, 207, 208, 211, 217,

229. A note on p. vi purports to correct an inaccuracy about R, but contains two further mistakes. 'Clarkius' is represented not by the contraction Cl. as we are told in the *Notae* but by Cla. (In the *B.G.* Cla. figures in the cr. app., but is left unexplained in the *Notae*.) One could multiply examples of this carelessness which makes one often feel distrust when differences from Kübler are shown in the record of MSS. readings. After this it seems a small matter to complain of Germanisms like 'cf. Suetonii reliquiae' and the confusing comma used perpetually at the end but not also at the beginning of relational sentences.

Klotz's text for the *B.Hisp.* should be studied with his annotated edition, in which valuable remarks will be found on its linguistic peculiarities. Much work remains to be done for all three books, but Klotz's contributions mark a real advance in the progress of Caesarian studies.

H. STEWART.

THE LACONIAN DIALECT.

Le Dialecte Laconien. (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, XXIII.) Par ÉMILE BOURGUET. Pp. 170. Paris: Champion, 1927.

THIS book, which is the outcome of lectures, is the work of one who is well versed in the subject, especially on its epigraphical side, and can refer his readers not only to the better-known manuals, but to other and more recondite sources of information. Preceded by a general introduction, in which the author's theses are advanced, the main part of the book is a corpus of select inscriptions, each accompanied by a commentary in which its most significant features are discussed. In M. Bourguet's hands this mode of exposition is markedly successful, and even those who have not devoted much attention to the Greek dialects will probably find his book helpful as an introduction to the whole subject. They will do well to bear in mind the fact (which is emphasised by M. Bour-

guet) that the Laconian texts are of a different nature from those of any other dialect. It is one of the chief merits of this book that it shows us how we must regard the Laconian texts differently at each period, and at no period allow ourselves to take them as adequately representing for us either the spoken Laconian or an artificial imitation of Laconian.

Occasionally M. Bourguet's discussion of particular points is not quite clear. The present reviewer has found it difficult to grasp exactly what inference he is expected to draw from the spellings *Τινδαρίδαι* (p. 6, *al.*) and *Θευρία* (p. 52, *al.*), or the meaning of the statement on p. 92 that the aorist in *-ξα* 'n'est vraiment dorien que quand on le rencontre dans un verbe où se trouvait déjà une gutturale,' or of the explanation of *ᾠτῶ* (p. 132). On the other hand, M. Bourguet's development of his general thesis (in itself not a simple one) regarding the right way to regard Laconian texts is very clear.

It is not often that the book arouses doubt or dissent, but the discussion of one of the most difficult problems—viz., the form written *γερωνία* in the Ravenna MS. of Aristophanes and *γερωνία* in Hesychius—fails to reveal one of the obstacles to the explanation which is offered. M. Bourguet, after arousing uneasiness by treating (p. 83) the preservation of *-ντ-* in *γερωντεύων* as a Laconian characteristic (the fact being that *-ντ-* in this position would survive in all dialects), assumes (pp. 145-7) a development *γερωντία* > *γερωνσία* > *γερωνία* (written *γερωνία* and *γερωνία*) and quotes *μωτja* (i.e., *μωτja*) > *μωά* as a parallel, without noticing that the difference between *γερωντία* (with syllabic *ι*) and *μωτja* (with non-syllabic *j* = Engl. *γ*) is all-important, and,

especially when taken together with the fact that *γερωντία* actually occurs, fully justifies Bechtel (*Griech. Dial.* II. 311) in accepting from Ahrens (II. 63) a quite different explanation of *γερωνία* which, it must be admitted, is itself not wholly satisfactory.

The book closes with a useful publication, based on independent study of the MSS., of the spurious decree against Timotheus (Boethius, *de Mus.* I. 1), and an index. The new edition of *Griech. Dialektinschriften* 311 (= Schwyzler 647, etc.), which M. Bourguet promises (p. 37), will be welcome. It does not appear to be very widely known that a re-examination of this stone was made for the publication in Cagnat, *Inscript. Graec. ad res Romanas pertinentes*, IV. 1302.

R. MCKENZIE.

TWO BOOKS ON VERGIL.

1. *Vergilio ed Enea*. Per NICOLA TERZAGHI. Pp. iii + 183. Palermo: Edizioni Sandron, 1928. Paper, 9 l.
2. *Le Réalisme dans les Bucoliques de Virgile*. Par JEAN HUBAUX. Pp. i + 141. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XXXVII., 1927. Paper, 18 fr.

THESE two books are very different; but since they are both about Vergil, and are both written with obvious disapproval of certain modern tendencies to see political allegory throughout the poet's work, they may be included in the same notice.

Vergil's characterisation of Aeneas is an old subject for literary criticism. But Signor Terzaghi has discussed the question in an interesting way, and he has made observations which are fresh. In the course of a study of the Fourth Book of the *Aeneid* (where he lays rather too much stress on the physical side of Dido's love), he examines closely the artistic and psychological reasons for the silence of Aeneas (a) after Mercury's rebuke and exhortation (IV. 279) and (b) after Dido's second outburst (IV. 393), pointing out the parallelism of the two passages. He draws the conclusion that the poet was himself conscious of the obvious difficulty which beset him

throughout the poem. Vergil wanted to give to Aeneas something of will-power and passion—qualities suitable to the hero of an Epic. But he also wanted—or was obliged—to make him submissive to the gods; for Roman religion was to be even more prominent in his poem than Roman patriotism. This difficulty is then illustrated by the fact that while in the course of the *Aeneid* 'pius' and 'pater' are sometimes used in a significant manner with Aeneas' name, they are more often introduced as 'stock' epithets merely to give the required religious and Augustan colour to the picture of the hero. The author objects to the assumption of some critics that the faith of Aeneas is also that of Vergil; and after examining the passages in the *Aeneid* in which religious doubt is suggested—here he does not seem to take into account the poet's sense of mystery—he inclines to the opinion that not only weaknesses in the hero's character but also many elements in the poem both of Roman religion and of Stoicism were forced on Vergil by his participation in the religious revival of Augustus. In such a study the author was obliged to touch lightly on many familiar themes with which he could hardly deal adequately in so small a compass. But the essay

makes stimulating reading, the best part being that which deals with Vergil's difficulties as an artist in the treatment of Aeneas and Dido.

M. Hubaux protests actively against the method of scholars who, when examining the originality of the Eclogues, first made a list of all the phrases in which some echo of Theocritus could be detected, and secondly assumed that what was then left of Vergil was mainly taken from real life. In many cases, he argues, where editors are still content with 'This is borrowed from Theocritus,' the changes made by Vergil are original and significant when the context and precise phraseology of the parallel passages are examined. But he criticises more than the first process of this method. He attacks the second, by making a positive contribution of importance. His thesis is that Vergil made use not only of Theocritus, but also of Meleager of Gadara,¹ and especially of such rare epigrams as have a rural setting. M. Hubaux is convincing in his explanation of the Second Eclogue, of Vergil's debt there to Meleager, and of the false traditions concerning the personality of Alexis. After illustrating the way in which Vergil used more than one model, he is in a better position for estimating the poet's real originality, and he does so with sound judgment and taste. Vergil's agricultural interests are well emphasised in a chapter on the countryside (here Professor Conway's recent argu-

ments about the 'local eclogues' receive support), and there is a short but illuminating section on realism in characterisation.

So far this book is excellent, and it cannot be neglected by anyone interested in the Eclogues. But when M. Hubaux tries to contribute to the vexed problem of the Theocritean text that Vergil knew, he is, as he admits, on dangerous ground. He is near to 'special pleading' when (with the further help of Meleager) he argues that it need not be assumed that Vergil imitated anything from Idylls XVIII. and X. For example, though we are shown important differences between Idyll X. 30-31 and Eclogue II. 63-65, yet the striking similarity remains, and we have to be content with the guess that Vergil was echoing some unknown poem now lost. Meleager does not help us here! Having once disposed of these two Idylls, M. Hubaux's conclusion can be attractively neat. He can suggest that there were only ten idylls known to Vergil, and that these were the ten which (according to Birt) was the number forming the *bucolic* collection. For in spite of Birt's objections he accepts the argument of Ahrens that Idyll II. was in the collection, which he supposes therefore to have consisted of Idylls I.-IX. and XI. Two only of noted misprints are misleading enough to be mentioned here: p. 30 (in the table) add XI. to the books of Theocritus that belong to Birt's *Contenu du Recueil supposé*, and p. 139, line 7, read 'IV., VI. et X.' (not 'IV., VII. et X.').

S. K. JOHNSON.

¹ Suggested by M. Hubaux in an article in the *Musée Belge* XXIX., pp. 1 ff.

THE ROMAN LEGIONS.

The Roman Legions. By H. M. D. PARKER, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford. Pp. i-viii + 9-291. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. 15s. net. ENGLISH books on the Roman army are rare, and with this scholarly and stimulating work Mr. Parker fills a gap in our historical literature which has long been patent.

Following an introduction on the pre-Marian army, Chapter I. discusses the NO. CCCXVIII. VOL. XLIII.

Marian reforms as to recruitment and tactical formation. Chapter II. treats the armies of Caesar and Pompey; the importance of the centurions therein is clearly illustrated, and the raising of these armies before and during the Civil War is carefully traced in detail. After an interesting vindication of Augustus' policy in maintaining a standing army, Mr. Parker is chiefly concerned in Chapters III. and IV. with determining the legionary strength of the imperial

armies. This section is probably one of those which the author had in mind when he said in his preface that considerable portions were technical and controversial. Yet his treatment is always clear; he presents in a convenient form, and discusses, the arguments of other historians both English and foreign. It is unfortunate, however, that more was not said in this connexion of the *auxilia*, or at least that allusion was not made to Cheesman's estimate of their strength (*Auxilia*, pp. 53-6); for then it might have been revealed what proportion the legions bore to the whole imperial army. In Chapter V., on the movements of the legions, lucidity is assured by the useful tables which show the provincial distribution of the legions at various periods. Here again more frequent reference to the *auxilia* might have been made; for the auxiliary strength in each province certainly did not vary in proportion to the legionary strength (Cheesman, *op. cit.* pp. 52, 145-169). Some general statement of the auxiliary distribution is necessary to prevent readers from gauging the adequacy of a province's garrison entirely by the legions quartered therein.

The next chapter, on the recruiting areas, is carefully worked out from epigraphic and literary evidence. It is serviceable in correcting the widely held view that Italy ceased supplying soldiers to the legions after A.D. 69. Mr. Parker abundantly proves that, in the Rhine and Danube legions at least, Italians continued to be prominent not only throughout the Julio-Claudian period but also up to the death of Trajan. This section is the more valuable in that here a comparison is made between the legions and the *auxilia*, and it is shown how the great areas of legionary recruiting provided few *auxilia*, while the sources of *auxilia* yielded scarcely any legionaries. Chapter VII. traces the duties and powers of the legionary officers, and gives an instructive account of the different classes whence centurions were drawn. This is followed by a chapter full of interest both for the historian and for the general reader: duration of service, pay, peace-time employment,

decorations and punishments, marriage, discharge, are treated attractively. The discussion of pay is duly supplemented by a discussion of the cost of living; frequent and interesting use is made of inscriptions and papyri throughout the chapter. Perhaps, when mentioning the building achievements of III *Augusta* in Africa, the author might have alluded to the evidence about the work of other legions collected by Cagnat in *Daremberg-Saglio*, s.v. 'Legio,' pp. 1062-3. The last chapter deals with equipment and formation; and the book concludes with appendices in which are treated the *cognomina*, emblems and origin of the Augustan legions, and the thorny problem of the promotion of centurions.

One or two errors of detail may be noted: 'elected' (p. 138) is hardly a fortunate word for Vespasian's appointment to the governorship of Judaea. It is misleading to say (p. 134) 'the title of *legatus pro praetore* implies a legionary army.' Doubtless, in the case in point, the assignment to Cappadocia of a legate instead of a procurator as governor is to be explained by the new policy of stationing legions in the province; but the quoted statement would mean that every province governed by a *legatus pro praetore* had a legionary garrison, a generalisation which Aquitania, Galatia, and other provinces disprove. The maps leave much to be desired. Neither the boundaries nor the general position of provinces are marked. The map of the eastern frontier gives no idea where the frontier or the buffer states lay. Antioch is omitted, and the Orontes is called Orantes. In the map of Britain, Watling Street is not given its full length. The Severn is made to rise in Shropshire. A great portion of the land marked as over 3,000 feet is really not much over 1,000. Verulamium and Londinium, the Trent and Great Ouse deserve insertion.

In a book of nearly 300 pages, however, such blemishes as I have found amount to very little; and Mr. Parker is to be congratulated on a contribution to knowledge deserving the cordial welcome of scholars and historians.

A. M. DUFF.

ROMAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY.

The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. By M. ROSTOV-TZEFF. Pp. xxv+695; 60 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. £2 5s.

THE composition of works of historical synthesis becomes ever more difficult with the growth of research and the multiplication of learned journals. And in ancient history this difficulty is accentuated when the subject chosen lies outside the limits of political history, with which the ancient writers are almost exclusively concerned. The material, archaeological, epigraphic, numismatic, papyrological, juridical, has to be collected from the most widely scattered periodicals, and its interpretation requires experience in branches of study so diverse in character as rarely to be approached by a single student. Perhaps the strongest impression created by Professor Rostovtzeff's work is at once the breadth and the detail of the study on which it is based. It is not too much to say that the 145 pages of notes (in small type) with their serried mass of references to works in at least ten languages, with their admirably concise discussions on points the evidence for which is often here collected for the first time, will long remain a treasured possession of all who are concerned with any aspect of the history of the Empire. But unlike some works of which a similar praise might seem merited—a well-known Greek history readily comes to the mind—the present book constantly challenges by the vigour and definiteness of its judgments and the originality of its views. Some will perhaps feel that, especially in the later chapters, a little too much of the present has been imported into the past, that, for example, the picture of a class-conscious peasant army in the third century at last taking revenge on an urban *bourgeoisie* for centuries of plunder and oppression, is hardly supported by adequate evidence, or necessary to explain the collapse, cultural and economic, no less than political, which occurred in that period. But this, and numerous other verdicts which will raise questionings and need detailed discus-

sion, if they are defects, are the defects of the qualities which alone made it possible to undertake and carry to a successful conclusion so immense a task.

The book is divided into twelve chapters. After an introductory sketch (his own word) of the last century of the Republic, Professor Rostovtzeff discusses in the second and third chapters 'Augustus and the Policy of Restoration and Reconstruction' and 'the Military Tyranny of the Julii and Claudii.' These also are brief because he is 'able to refer the reader to modern books where the subject is thoroughly treated.' Chapters IV. to XI. form 'the core of the book' and deal with the history of the second and third centuries, 'the most neglected periods in the history of the Roman Empire.' Chapters IV. and V. deal with the rule of the Flavians and Antonines and the state of the Empire under them; VI. and VII. survey the city and the country-side in Italy and the European provinces, and in the Asiatic and African provinces respectively. Most readers will perhaps find these two chapters the most valuable of the whole book. Much has been written in detail on the urban civilisation in the provinces, and there exist other good surveys of the whole field, although nowhere perhaps is the material more ably and concisely handled than here. But the description of non-urban conditions in general has no predecessor, and here, in a field which has long been peculiarly his own, Professor Rostovtzeff gives a sketch the value of which is hard to over-estimate.

Chapter VIII. sums up on the basis of these accounts 'the Social and Economic Policy of the Flavians and Antonines.' Chapters IX. to XI. deal with the 'Military Monarchy' of the House of Severus, the 'Military Anarchy' which followed it, and the condition of the Empire during the period from Commodus to Diocletian. Finally Chapter XII. gives a sketch of the 'Oriental Despotism and the Problem of the Decay of Ancient Civilisation.' To abbreviate still further the summary of the point of view

towards the subject given in the preface—the late Republic was a period of dominance of a class of half-feudal landowners and business men who exploited the Empire for their profit and owed political power to their wealth; the foundation of the Empire substituted for this the supremacy of a *bourgeoisie* of city-dwellers at first confined to Italy (Roman citizens), then spreading over the provinces in cities already existing or newly founded. Gradually there appeared an increasing cleavage between this middle class and the proletariat in the cities and still more the peasantry, and the history of the second century shows the gradual failure of the government, in a period of growing distress, to remove this hostility. The failure was complete under

the House of Severus, and in the anarchy which followed the peasant army took its revenge, and brought into being a State based on the army, a strong bureaucracy, and the mass of the peasants, and thereby went far to destroy the whole fabric of ancient civilisation.

The sixty well produced plates, each provided with an interpretative commentary, are, as the Preface observes, an essential part of the book. Drawn from Professor Rostovtzeff's unrivalled knowledge of the archaeological material, they provide in fact a commentary on the text, and in part the evidence on which it is based, and from both points of view enormously enhance the value of the work.

D. ATKINSON.

FREEDMEN IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE.

Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire.

By A. M. DUFF. Pp. xii + 252; 11 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. 12s. 6d.

WHILE slaves were in common use among more than one ancient people, freedmen did not play an important part except in the Roman Empire—here alone were manumissions and enfranchisements frequent enough to create a distinct class of freedman-citizen. The subject of the Roman freedman, therefore, well repays investigation. But research on this topic is beset by a peculiar difficulty. In their attitude towards *libertini* Roman society was caught between two minds—it looked down upon them and their typical pursuits, yet it allowed them to become almost indispensable; and, true to their usual opportunism, Roman legislators never troubled themselves to issue a comprehensive and consistent code of law on freedmen, but improvised a solution for each problem of detail as it presented itself. Hence the status of the *libertinus* cannot be defined in one simple formula, and the border-lines between his activities and those of the slaves and free-born are anything but regular. Mr. Duff has faced this difficulty squarely. He has avoided the chief danger in writing a book of this

kind—that of simplifying unduly. At the same time he has endeavoured to explain and appreciate as well as to set out the facts; consequently his work, besides being accurate, is interesting. We would specially commend his chapters on the legal position of the freedmen and on their activities in the administrative bureaux of the Caesars: the latter chapter is a good compendium of the mechanism of government under the early emperors.

Among the points of detail which Mr. Duff establishes, the following are specially noteworthy. The extensive emigration of Italians was not compensated by any considerable influx of free aliens; the *lex Iunia* probably belongs to 17 B.C., and so precedes the *lex Aelia Sentia*; the new equestrian staff of Hadrian's administration was largely of servile descent; freedmen had better opportunities in the public life of Italian and provincial *municipia* than at Rome; freedmen hardly ever succeeded in capturing the highest posts in the professions.

A few of Mr. Duff's statements seem to require modification: (i.) Was Augustus' legislation concerning freedmen directed against the 'orientalisation' of Italy? If so, he ought to have restricted immigration and to have issued

a general ban on marriages between free-born and freed. (ii.) 'Owners (of potteries) were free citizens' (p. 113). It should be added that instances of ownership by libertini are on record (Park, *The Plebs in Cicero's Day*, p. 85). (iii.) Mr. Duff is well aware that a Greek name is not sufficient proof of Greek origin, in a slave or ex-slave, but is perhaps too ready to accept it as evidence of actual libertine status, as against mere descent from freedmen. In the

gild inscriptions from Ostia (*C.I.L.* XIV. 250-1), which contain hundreds of Greek names, only a minute fraction of the members describe themselves as LIB or IVN (Iuniani?).

Altogether, Mr. Duff's book is a valuable piece of work; taken together with Mr. Barrow's recent treatise on Roman slavery it provides a comprehensive and very competent account of the population below full citizen rank.

M. CARY.

SENECA'S *SUASORIAE*.

The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder. Introductory Essay, Text, Translation and Explanatory Notes by WILLIAM A. EDWARD, M.A., D.Litt. Pp. xlvii + 160. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

FOR this work Mr. Edward, who is Director of Studies at the Aberdeen Training Centre, was given the degree of D.Litt. in the University of Glasgow. It scarcely ranks in scholarship with the works of H. J. Müller and H. Bornecque, which remain indispensable, but it has been given sufficient care to deserve a warm welcome. It is good that part, at least, of Seneca's work should be readily accessible to younger students, because acquaintance with it will undoubtedly add to their understanding of Latin life and literature. Mr. Edward's introduction is clear and adequate, and brings out plainly Seneca's character. Mr. Edward regrets that so little has been written on Seneca in English. Probably Professor J. Wight Duff's *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*, published at the end of 1927, was too late for him; but his introduction must now face comparison with Mr. Duff's two excellent chapters on pp. 23-64, and it is a pity that he has no knowledge of T. S. Simonds' *The Themes treated by the Elder Seneca*, Baltimore, 1896. In the discussion of *declamare* note might have been taken of Mr. F. H. Colson's equation of the word with *κατηχεῖν* in *C.R.* XXXVI., 1922, pp. 116-117. The bibliography is useful, but it need not have omitted the works of Tivier, Karsten, and Ahlheim.

Mr. Edward bases his text on that of

H. J. Müller. He makes a few suggestions of his own, of which the most noteworthy is *aequiores* for *et quia* in the desperate passage in VI. 16; he also gives some proposals by the late Professor J. S. Phillimore, of which the most interesting is *cui contentio esset ne quis sibi e tribus* in VI. 13. Mr. Edward seems unaware that his own suggestion, which is probably right, about *iamque uident* in I. 15, was made a quarter of a century ago by R. G. Kent in *C.R.* XVII. 1903, pp. 311-312, and in his note Withof's original proposal is ascribed to Gertz in spite of his own disclaimer in *B.Ph.W.*, 1888, 525. It would have been better if it had always been pointed out when there is no MS. authority for what is given in the text. At VI. 13, where we are told only that 'the MSS. are very corrupt' and so cannot judge the two emendations recorded, Helm's *ac<loco> dato rogari* (*B.Ph.W.*, 1904, 15), and at I. 8 Linde's *iustis*, should at least have been mentioned.

Mr. Edward's translation, which follows, instead of being more conveniently opposite, his text, is in the main commendably accurate. But there are some awkward phrases like 'to abandon other evidences' and 'antique rigour,' and the verse quotations are translated into prose. In I. 5 *quibus etiam quae prosunt ita tamen ut delectent suadenda sunt* is translated by 'unpalatable counsel must not be given to these even for their good,' and in VII. 4 *animi sui contemptus*, which must mean 'their self-contempt,' by 'the contempt they inspired.' There are omissions in II. 1 and II. 14, a needless bowdlerisation in VI. 3, and in VII. 11

text and translation do not match one another.

Mr. Edward gives an abundance of useful information in his notes, and obviously he would rather write what was superfluous than omit what might possibly be thought essential. But was it worth while on pp. 90-91, because *capit* occurs meaning 'contains,' after saying 'this use of *capio* is interesting and can easily be paralleled,' to proceed to quote twelve examples, excluding two of *sufficio*, and on p. 106 to quote two more and to give three other references? Surely the space could have been used to better advantage. For example, at II. 3, on the unwallled condition of Sparta, Aristotle, *Politics* VII. 1330b 32, at II. 5 Manilius IV. 687-688 and on *suasoria* III. Petronius I. 6, might have been quoted. To the passages on Othryades on p. 104 might be added Ps. Plut., *Parall. Graeca et Romana* 3. 306 A-B and Ovid, *Fasti* II. 663-666; cp. also A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II., p. 111. In the passage from Florus I. 18. 14, where Mr. Edward makes no comment on the confusion of Leonidas and Othryades, Sauppe's ingenious *suo parserit sanguini* might have been noticed. On p. 133 it is implied that *o tempora, o mores!* occurs only in *In Cat. I. 2* and *In Verrem* IV. 56; but it occurs also in *De domo sua* 137 and *Pro rege Deiotaro* 31.

There are very few misprints, but on p. xviii 'anguish' should be 'languish'

and on p. xli 'qui eloquent' should be 'quite eloquent.' The statement on p. 156 'there were then at least two books of *Suasoriae*, perhaps more' conflicts with that on p. ix 'it (sc. Seneca's book) consisted of ten books of *Controversiae* and one of *Suasoriae*.' I wonder why Mr. Edward uses, instead of Quint., the abbreviation *Quin.*, although it suggests at once something less palatable than Quintilian.

Gratitude to Mr. Edward for his painstaking work is tempered with regret that his style does not always make comfortable reading. One finds sentences like 'he was a wealthy man, a man of culture, not a professional rhetorician, not so far as we know an imperial official, but the first would certainly necessitate his frequent presence in Spain to look after his estates, and the second certainly necessitated long periods in Rome' (p. xxv); 'the main outline hinged on the above questions' (p. 117); 'Cato was not personally present either at Pharsalia or at Thapsus. In the former case he was at Corcyra, holding it for Pompey, in the latter he was at Utica; Scipio commanded in the battle' (p. 132); 'this connecting text was very subordinate, and it was apparently undignified for a great writer to descend to the writing of such' (p. 114); and 'relictum must be emended to *relinquit*, as Haupt did' (p. 100).

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

SENECA DE BENEFICIIS.

SÉNÈQUE, *Des Bienfaits*. Tome II.

Texte établi et traduit par FRANÇOIS PRÉCHAC. Pp. 224. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Paper, 18 f.

FRENCH scholars have given much attention to Seneca of recent years, and Mr. Préchac, who edited the *De Clementia* in 1921, has now turned to the *De Beneficiis*. The first volume, which was published in 1926, has not come to hand, and the second, containing the last three books, must be noticed briefly. Mr. Préchac's respect for the Nazarianus is strong, and it is his desire to keep closer to it than earlier critics have done that is responsible for most of his emendations, which number more than sixty

and of which all but two are in the text. Many of these are at least plausible, but some, such as *inuictus quam* in V. 4. 1, are scarcely needed. The *apparatus criticus* is much shorter than Hosius', and ill-judged proposals, like Koch's *sedem* in V. 12. 6, receive no mention. But Gertz' *pilum* in V. 6. 3 might have been recorded, and in VII. 19. 7 Mr. Préchac should not propose *Phalarim tyrannum et Apollodorum* while suppressing Rossbach's *Phalarim et Apollodorum*. In VII. 26. 1 Kronenberg's *dic* (C.Q., XVII., 1923, p. 47) before *quid* is perhaps better than *quaero* after *debeam*.

Mr. Préchac's translation is alert and very accurate, but in V. 8. 4 *ut in orbe*

ac pila is not rightly rendered by 'quand la balle fait le tour du rond,' in VI. 7. 3 'aux bêtes brutes' implies Hosius' unnecessary *brutis* rather than *mutis*, in VII. 15. 4, where the text is *nemo aduersus deos gratus est, et in quos uoluntas sola confertur*, the translation is 'nul n'est reconnaissant envers les dieux, à qui l'on n'offre non plus que sa bonne volonté,' although it is not even mentioned that G omits *et*; in VII. 21. 1 *elatus* before *combustus* means 'carried out of the house' rather than 'porté en terre'; and in VII. 21. 2 is 'comprenant qu'il s'était laissé tenter par cette misérable aubaine' quite adequate for *intellegens adrisisse illud lucellum sibi?* Words are left untranslated in V. 3. 1, V. 17. 7, VII. 1. 1 and VII. 5. 2.

The text and translation sometimes

overlap inconveniently, and it is a pity that the book is disfigured by at least thirty-five misprints, five of which occur on the page and a half of *Erratum* referring to the first volume. Fortunately they are seldom more serious than *fragilitis* for *fragilitatis* in VI. 3. 2, but the reader gets little help from the note in the *apparatus criticus* at VI. 27. 2, which reads 'bene meritum: uene meritum.'

Mr. Préchac gives an *Index Nominum* at the end of the book and occasional explanatory notes at the foot of the pages of translation. Persius II. 5-7 might have been compared at VI. 38. 5, and in VI. 41. 2 *nulla mora in Turno est* should have been given its reference—Virgil, *Aeneid* XII. 11.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

THE BARBARIAN INVASIONS.

The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians: a Series of Lectures. By the late PROFESSOR J. B. BURY. Pp. xii + 296. London: Macmillan and Co., 1928. 12s. 6d. net.

It was a happy thought of Professor Hearnshaw to publish this set of fifteen lectures, which gives a welcome survey of the gradual dismemberment of the western half of the Roman Empire down to the settlement of the Lombards in Italy (A.D. 568-572). He that runs may read the interesting story in this single volume, which eschews all subsidiary detail and focusses attention on the process of the formation of the barbarian kingdoms, the influences at work, the attitude of the leaders towards the Empire, and the character of the new kingdoms. The survey is enriched by valuable interpretations which represent the fruit of long study. Emphasis is very properly laid on the gradual Germanisation of the Empire, which began with the settlement of Germans within the frontiers (in and after the time of M. Aurelius), and was promoted by the admission to the army of barbarian volunteers—the best recruits—until in the latter part of the fourth century the highest posts were largely held by soldiers of German origin. Such growth of German power and influence was a

danger which was not realised by the Emperors of the day. Of great importance, too, was the way in which the settlement of new peoples within the Empire took place. There was no cataclysmic upheaval. They were admitted as *foederati*—as allies on a semi-independent footing owing definite obligations to the Emperor—by an extended application of the old system of quartering soldiers, whereby a third of the land was conceded by the owners to their unwelcome guests. This eased the process of dismemberment and brought the new settlers under the influence of Roman civilisation. Even the Ostrogothic conquest of Italy at the end of the fifth century was based on the same principles, and its régime depended constitutionally on a compact made with the Emperor at Constantinople, whose supremacy was recognised after an Emperor of the West had ceased to exist. In this connexion Professor Bury makes some just observations on the misleading description of the deposition of Romulus Augustulus as marking 'the fall of the Western Empire.'

Interesting and convincing are the views expressed about the parts played by the Huns and the Vandals in shaping the destinies of Europe. Professor Bury denies to the battle of Châlons (or

rather of Troyes) the historical significance usually claimed for it: its importance was the moral injury it dealt to Attila, whose invasion of Gaul was already checked. More momentous was the Pannonian battle three years later, in which the subject German tribes overthrew the Hunnic Empire. Despite our journalists, the Huns have some claim on our gratitude. By controlling the East German tribes beyond the Danube, and by lending military support to the Empire against its German foes, they retarded German progress and forced tribes which penetrated into imperial territory to accept the position of federates—which was a service to

civilisation. Less can be said in favour of the Vandals, whose occupation of Africa profoundly weakened Roman power in Gaul and Spain and in Italy itself, and fostered the growth of the new German kingdoms.

The reader will find reproduced one view which has not won acceptance, that the Roman abandonment of Britain is to be dated to A.D. 442, instead of 410. It may be added that, while notes and references are hardly to be expected in a volume of this sort, one or two sketch maps, showing the distribution of the invaders in Europe, would have been a help (at little cost) to the reader.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

THE ROMANESQUE LYRIC.

The Romanesque Lyric. Studies in its background and development from Petronius to the Cambridge Songs, 50 - 1050. By PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN. With renderings into English verse by Howard Mumford Jones. Pp. xx + 374. University of North Carolina Press, 1928. 21s. net.

ALL those who enjoyed Miss Helen Waddell's *Wandering Scholars* will be glad to have this study of the first age of the medieval Latin lyric. Professor Allen's thesis, sometimes rather overloaded with extraneous matter, such as the chapter on early Arabian poetry, the influence of which on the West he suggests but hardly proves, is that there was a lyrical spirit inherent in the Italic and Gaulish races, which occasionally peeped out in Latin poetry through the surface-culture borrowed from Greece, and that this spirit came up again, so to speak, in Merovingian and Carolingian literature, and attained its first full blooming in the tenth century; after another eclipse, it was to appear anew in the twelfth, and of this we shall hear more in another volume.

It is a book that needs rather close reading; it is developed from a series of chapters which Professor Allen contributed to *Modern Philology* just twenty years ago, and has probably since passed through the stage of more than one course of lectures; and again and again as we seem to be approaching the conclusion of the argument, we are led aside into a mass of illustrative and comparative matter which distracts our attention from the main theme. But read carefully, with the notes (which are rather tiresomely placed all together at the end of the book), it does throw a good deal of illumination upon a difficult subject, the study of which is perhaps only in its first stages.

Mr. Mumford Jones's translations are uneven. He does not succeed with regular, polished pieces, and for these would have done better to accept existing renderings; with the more rugged poems he does better, witness the sixth-century hymns by Irish writers.

S. GASELEE.

Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons. By TH. MARSSCHALL. Pp. 108. Munich: Lehmaier, 1928.

THIS dissertation aims at fixing both the absolute and, more especially, the relative chronology of Xenophon's writings, with the exception of the *Anabasis* and the *Hellenica*. It places the entire series of these between 367 and c. 360 B.C.,

the *Memorabilia* c. 364, and the *Cyropædia* after that year. The attempt to stratify the selected works of Xenophon is beset by peculiar difficulties. Not only are these remarkably sparing in allusions to current events, but they show little progression of thought or development of style. Besides, one must not look for any startling transformations in the philosophy or the crafts-

manship of any person writing between the ages of sixty and seventy, however superior he might be to Xenophon in intellectual fibre.

For the absolute chronology of the works under consideration Dr. Marschall utilises some stray allusions to the war-situation of the sixties, and especially to the insecure relations between Athens and Thebes. His relative chronology is based on the detection of occasional changes in points of view on Xenophon's part—e.g., his growing austerity in relation to physical pleasures, and increasing belief in seer-craft as against honest reasoning—and on a close study of the many parallel passages in which Xenophon reiterates some darling idea. The working principle which Dr. Marschall here applies is that a passage in which a given argument is introduced less aptly, or stated less completely, is a mere echo, and not the original voice. In the nature of things a proof of this kind cannot compel assent. But Dr. Marschall at any rate eschews the bad habit of amputating refractory lumps out of the Xenophonic corpus, and he bases his reasoning on a considerable collection of instances. His thesis, therefore, is deserving of serious consideration.

M. CARY.

Studien zur geschichtlichen Anschauung des Polybios. By WALTER SIEGFRIED. Pp. viii+106. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1928. RM. 4.60.

THIS little book is a definite contribution to the study of Polybius, and its point, which I think is new, is well made, with a wealth of citation. Briefly, it is that Polybius' 'pragmatic' history—men's acts and their mundane causes—is only part of the matter; it is set in a religious-metaphysical framework, and beside Polybius the political writer stands Polybius the writer of history on a religious basis. What that basis is Polybius does not know; but he believes that human causation will not account for anything like the whole of history, and that there is something else at work. Sometimes he calls this *ταῖς τύχαις*, 'chance' or 'accident'; but he will not allow much influence to chance, and polemises against some unknown writer who does. Sometimes, though rarely, he calls it the divinity; but the justice of heaven has to be preserved, and as human events are not remarkable for justice the direct influence of heaven is small. But usually he calls it *τύχη*, Fortune, a term which ranges in meaning from chance to deity, but is certainly not chance; it is a law, a world-order, but a law whose working none can understand, though certain things may be counted on, e.g. it habitually strikes down the successful, and its habit of bringing upon people what even now is called a 'judgment' enables Polybius himself to pass moral judgments on his actors; sometimes it almost becomes Fate. One knew of course that Polybius made much use of *τύχη*, and that the Hellenistic *τύχη* was an order of events, though one which men could not follow; what is new is the conception of the part *τύχη* plays as a religious setting for the whole (as against e.g. the view that it is mere popular moralising). This may explain why Polybius' mundane causes often seem inadequate; the real cause was the mysterious Power

to whom the gods had committed the governance of this unsatisfactory planet, and whose dealings with men Polybius honestly tries to record, though he cannot understand them. All this, the main part of the book, is most interesting, though to say that Polybius sees in *τύχη* the driving force of all history (p. 88) doubtless goes too far. The first chapter deals briefly with the characteristics of earlier Hellenistic history, as a background, and is not very new; much is true, but much is missing. It seems inadequate to discuss universalism without noticing that the themes of Herodotus and Polybius are twins (Persia fails to conquer the known world, Rome succeeds); and to be told that Polybius abandons 'tragic' history, meaning only Duris' theatricalism, strikes a wrong note; Polybius is as much a tragedy as Thucydides—the tragedy of Hellenism—as I think the writer really knows (p. 100). What one really misses, however, is a history of the idea of *τύχη* between (say) Alexander's age and Polybius; that is the background we want. It would not be easy to do; but I hope that the author will some day do it. W. W. TARN.

Cicero: De l'Orateur. Livre II. Texte établi et traduit par EDMOND COURBAUD. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Paper, 20 fr.

COURBAUD died during the printing of this volume, and the editing of the notes and revision of the final text proofs have been done by Martha. For dealing with the M and L traditions Courbaud had already in 1905 laid down eclectic principles, and since that date the work of Stroux on V has placed L in a much stronger position. There can be no doubt now that Friedrich's devotion to M was excessive. Courbaud, while recognising its sounder tradition, abandons it for L at over fifty places where it is retained by Wilkins's Oxford text, which is itself in closer agreement with Courbaud than the annotated edition (1892). Courbaud follows L also in several places where Wilkins adopts an *m* reading or emendation. Apart from the citations of V under L, where it of course takes precedence of O and P, specific reference to its readings are here for the first time in a text given at close on 150 places. In thirty-six of these V has the reading accepted by both Wilkins and Courbaud. In the following passages Courbaud adopts it against Wilkins: 16 *videatur VR*, 111 *videntur melius V*, 141 (*sed*) *om. MV*, 150 *sumus usi V*, 209 *parta VO²P*, 216 *aut misericordia V*, 263 *cohortem M (i.e. H) V*, 330 *ne illa MVO*, 342 *del MV*. All these readings seem preferable. Courbaud admits few emendations. He writes himself down responsible for fifteen changes, though of these six at least are other men's property. The most striking and least successful are at 65, where he omits *genere* and takes *infinita* as 'vaste, infinie'; 197 and 200, where he reads *quaestore* for *sodali*, L at 197 having *s. et q.*; and 336, where he omits *quidque . . . non sit* and *aut si . . . adjertur*. In this last case he is influenced partly by considerations of rhythm, for which in fourteen other instances changes

are made or readings are preferred. The deliberate variation in spelling is extreme. With Friedrich he reads *M's excellent* in 85 and the scarce believable *cum . . . quom . . . cum* in 345.

The apparatus, though containing slips of various kinds, is at once fuller and more accurate than Wilkins's. It is excessively inhospitable to emendations whether modern or 'des gens de la Renaissance.' *Lucilius* is ignored in 284. Wilkins and Reid are not mentioned, nor Friedrich's addition in 224, nor Stangl's transpositions in 38 and 88. The translation is spirited, luminous, a little free, here and there disputable, very occasionally verbose, as for *manus lava et cena*: 'va te laver les mains, et tu viendras ensuite souper chez moi.' In 260 'En ton âme et conscience, es-tu marié?' 'Oui, mais nullement certes au gré de mon âme' is flat compared with the well-known 'Have you a wife, so help you God?' 'I have a wife, God help me.' There are some historical inaccuracies and omissions in the notes. No new suggestion is made for the obscure allusions.

This edition is indispensable for students of Cicero's rhetorical writings. It is to be hoped that Courbaud, whose death we deplore, has left work on Book III. sufficiently advanced to justify publication under his name. The clear uncrowded type, free use of paragraphs, and general though not flawless accuracy of printing, make this an attractive volume to the eye. Like the rest of its series it does not endure usage by the hand. H. STEWART.

Aere Perennius—Scherts en Ernst in de Oden van Horatius. Door C. P. BURGER, Jr. Pp. xii + 336. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1926.

A PLEASANTLY written, suggestive book that merits translation. Odes i. 26, 27, 36, 38; ii. 7, 11, 15 (this one pre-eminently); iii. 14, 17, 19 are 'satire.' iii. 19 sketches the dinner in Murena's house at Formiae 37 B.C., ll. 1-8 being addressed by Maecenas to H. or Heliodorus sent together ahead. To the same date belong i. 7 (Plancus' acquaintance made at Brundisium), i. 27 (ll. 1-4 spoken by H., the rest by Maecenas), i. 28 (H. and Heliodorus on a pilgrimage to Archytas' tomb after Brundisium) and ii. 11 (light-hearted fooling at dinner). In i. 38 H.'s humour has been tickled by a simple celebration of the grape harvest by a wealthy friend, presumably Maecenas. The *Lamia* of i. 26, 36 is not the consul of 3 A.D., he of iii. 17 is a country cousin of this *Lamia*, the poem recalling with light mockery the landjonker's conversation. iii. 14 is a poetaster's oration with interruptions from the audience. i. 12, 32 and iii. 25 are improvisations in company. i. 14, 30; iii. 18, 26 are occasional poems, i. 14 to a friend escaped from one love affair. In iii. 18 the animals are mummings and the *frondes* cabbage-leaves from kitchen-gardens; Faunus with nymphs is engraved on the altar, an Amor with bowl on the cratera. In iii. 26 the speaker is Amor. Peculiarities in a score of odes are due to their being allusive answers to elegies or letters. Thus i. 22 is a riposte to verses by Fuscus; iii. 8 replies to

a 'dialogue' poem by Maecenas in Latin and Greek. iii. 1-6 are not a cycle; iii. 1, like ii. 16 and iii. 16, deals with the secretaryship affair. iii. 2, and perhaps 3 1-8, reproduce seriously a draft poem by the imaginative idealist Iccius; i. 29 refers humorously to the completed poem. iv. 8, 13 ff. satirise with quotations the bombast and ignorance of an unveiling speech, the *Karthago* slip being irresistible despite the metrical licence involved. Burger closes by rejecting in an inexhaustive discussion the 4th rule and the possibility of interpolation. Some bad emendations are proposed. He does not know Verrall's writings or Campbell's book. His views are sometimes unlikely, often worth consideration, and occasionally attractive. The whole forms an excellent introduction to the problems of the Odes. H. STEWART.

Cicero: Tusculan Disputations. With an English translation by J. E. KING, Litt.D. Pp. xxxvii + 578. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1927. Cloth, 10s.

THE meagre list of 'books' and the elementary, sometimes naive, character of the introduction and many notes indicate that this book was designed much more for the general reader than the serious student. That, however, is no excuse for an uncritical, occasionally untranslatable, text based on the long-superseded editions of Klotz and Baiter-Kayser, for inaccurate references, for un-Ciceronian spelling—e.g. *ingenii*, *ii*, *eiice* (in the notes *coelum*, *coelestis*, *J*, *j*, the last figuring once even in the text)—and for a general lack of precision and system that mars even the appendix (Cicero's translations and the original Greek) and useful index. In the notes numerous sins of commission and omission strike one forcibly. The translation, exact enough for the most part though laboured and undistinguished, betrays ignorance of Cicero's idiom, and not infrequently blunders badly over his meaning. It drags in one or two Biblical quotations. Of the attempts at metrical translations most are contorted and uncouth. Dr. King is not an authority on metre. A note on anapaests is at best misleading, and in the trochaic line in IV. 48 he reads *queruntur* (and translates *questions ask*). It would have been proper and prudent to have admitted many obligations to Professor Dougan's renderings. H. STEWART.

Studies in the Orations of Libanius. By G. MIDDLETON. Part II.: *Further Imitations of Classical Writers in Libanius' Orations*. Pp. 10. Aberdeen: The University Press, 1928.

THE first part of Dr. Middleton's admirable studies in the orations of Libanius appeared in 1919, and was concerned with imitations of classical writers in them. The same intimate knowledge of classical Greek writers which he showed in the first part is evident also in the second. The authors here selected for illustration are Plato, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Isocrates, and the parallels furnished are con-

vincing. Dr. Middleton appends two emendations on Libanius' text, which will gain general approval. He has further valuable material on Libanius ready for press, and it is much to be hoped that it will see the light.

A. SOUTER.

The Language and Style of the Letters of St. Basil. A Dissertation submitted . . . for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By SISTER AGNES CLARE WAY. Pp. xvi+230. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1927.

THIS work comprises Vol. XIII. in the Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America. It is divided into three main parts, concerned with syntax, vocabulary, and style respectively. The author has obviously spent much labour on her task, and the book will prove useful to students of late Greek. Her special aim has been to deal with the unclassical element in St. Basil's letters. The part dealing with syntax, though good as far as it goes, leaves certain questions unanswered: one would have liked to hear something of *πρίν*, *ἔως*, *ἐφ' ᾧ*, for example, and if these expressions do not occur in Basil, it would be interesting to note the fact. The use of *ἐν* with the dative to express means is called 'poetic' (pp. 6, 13), but it used to be considered a Hebraism till it was found in papyri: on p. 16 *ἀφειδῶς* and *ἐλλειπῶς* are wrongly placed among the adverbs formed from participles. The section dealing with vocabulary is perhaps the most welcome, though the writer does not appear to know Preisigke's *Wörterbuch*, which would have given her full information of the vocabulary of papyri; nor does she seem to have studied inscriptions sufficiently. What is worse is that the Concordance to the Greek New Testament has not been scanned with sufficient care. For example, the word *σύμβιος* (p. 132) occurs hundreds of times in the inscriptions of Asia Minor, and *εὐφροσύνη*, said (on p. 85) to occur only in poetry, occurs twice in the New Testament. On p. 47 *προκαταλέων* is given as a possible alternative form for *προκαταλαίω*; on p. 50 *κλιμακῆδόν* is said to come from two nouns; on p. 51 *σκανδαλίζω* means *I cause to fall*, not *I fall*; under *φυλοκρινέω* (p. 58) add Synesius, as also under *ἐναποσίθημι* (p. 59) and *ἐπαρχος* (p. 128); on p. 74 and elsewhere Tertullian is quoted, as if he were a Greek writer, for Greek words that he does not use, and where his only connexion is that of subject-matter; *ἀπόδεκτος* (p. 89), *πρόσκαιρος* (p. 95), *διώκω*, *I persecute* (p. 138), *ἀπόβλητος* (p. 120), *στερέωμα* (p. 132) are in the New Testament; *ποιμνία* (p. 105) should be *ποιμνιον*, and *λόγιος* (p. 115) should be *λόγιον*; the Christian meaning of *συνδιάκονος* is omitted (p. 119). The Latin words used by Basil (pp. 159 f.) are a very welcome and interesting list, as is also the writer's treatment of honorary titles for ecclesiastics, etc. (pp. 160 ff.). On p. 159 the error *θησερτόρων* for the correct *θησερτόρων* might have been pointed out, confusion of *ο* and *ω* being very common in MSS.; *τρακτεντής* can hardly be called a Latin

word (p. 160). The writer does not seem to suspect that the use of the iota subscript in the infinitive (p. 173) may be purely editorial. It appears to me that this, the most valuable part of the book, suffers rather from over-classification. The section on style, in which instances of various figures used by Basil are given, calls for no comment. The book is well indexed, but contains too many misprints, which are by no means confined to the Greek accents.

A. SOUTER.

A Concordance of Boethius, the five Theological Tractates and The Consolation of Philosophy. Compiled by LANE COOPER. Pp. xii+467. Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1928. 5 dollars, post free.

PROFESSOR LANE COOPER, of Cornell University, and his helpers have produced in this work a volume which will be heartily welcomed by various classes of scholars. For the diction of the *Consolation of Philosophy* one has hitherto had to depend on the antiquated index in the Valpy-Delphin edition, and for the theological tractates one had to make one's own index. The model for the present work was the writer's much valued *Concordance to the Works of Horace* (1916). The various noun and verb forms are independently listed, each line bears one complete quotation, and the references are placed at the end of the lines. It is thus the easiest thing in the world to find the passage of which one is in search. Boethius is a purist and comes as near to the classical idiom as was possible for a writer of his day: for instance, he has *saepe* twenty times, never *frequent* or *subinde*.

A. SOUTER.

Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Herausgegeben von A. GERCKE und E. NORDEN. 3. Auflage. 1. Band. 2. Heft. Textkritik, von P. MAAS; pp. 18. Supplement; pp. xvi+36. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927. Kartonniert, 1.20 and 2.40 marks.

MAAS gives a capital introduction to textual criticism, with wise words that should help scholars to clear their thoughts about *contaminatio*, for example, and warn them against the *codex optimus* which too often 'sich als der *codex unicus* entpuppt.' Even critics who know their business may read him with profit and be confirmed in the faith. Though he overlooks Lindsay's *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, he is familiar with the best of English scholarship; indeed, among his examples of masterly restoration are *nona aetas* in Lucan VII. 387 and *Opis carissime nato* in Catull. LXIV. 324. An interesting page tells how he himself was led to refashion Callim. H. IV. 226 f. thus:

ἀλλὰ φίλη (δόνασαι γάρ) ἀμύνει πόντια δούλους
ἡμετέρου, αἱ σείο πέδον πατέουσιν ἐφετμήν.

This text, he thinks, will save *πῆδον* in Aesch. Ag. 1357 and Cho. 643. Better read *πῆδος* here also; and perhaps *ἡμετέρου*.

The Supplement contains prefaces, indexes, etc., and thirteen pages of Nachträge, the chief

of which deal with the Byzantine scholars and with some metrical rules: 'Die Bukolische Brücke' and 'Die Wilamowitz-Knoxsche Brücke,' the latter of which is of interest to students of the early history of the trimeter.

The whole volume can now be had, bound, for 32 marks.

E. HARRISON.

The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse.

Chosen by STEPHEN GASELEE, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Pp. xiv + 250. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928.

Cloth, 8s. 6d. net; India paper, 10s. net.

THE appearance of an Oxford book of medieval Latin verse is a fresh sign of the interest that is being taken in a body of poetry which now requires no apology. It is no longer necessary to lay emphasis on its purely historical importance in order to make it acceptable to classical scholars and others. Mr. Gaselee has made an admirable selection. He has avoided, on the one hand, the compiling of a book of 'specimens,' and, on the other, he has not allowed Prudentius and Adam of St. Victor to loom as large as one or two poets have done in classical anthologies. He has not ended with the *Dies Irae*, but has boldly chosen a number of good poems from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. I am sorry that he has found no room for Paulinus of Nola, and I think that Hildebert and Baudri deserved a larger space. But we

have to thank Mr. Gaselee for the best text of *Dulcis Iesu memoria* that has yet appeared. Further, he has wisely given as many profane pieces as possible.

The too brief Introduction to the volume only makes us wish that Mr. Gaselee had given us more of his wisdom and learning. The notes are good, but they call for a few insignificant comments. P. 214, the battle of Fontenoy was not fought against the Normans; p. 220, I think that the MS. evidence for Marbod's authorship of the *Liber Lapidum* is good; p. 233, Blume puts the *Verbum bonum et suave* at the end of the eleventh century. On p. 9 for 'totum' read 'rorem'; p. 137, in the *Veni, Sancte Spiritus*, 'nihil est in lumine' is a more satisfactory reading than 'in homine,' even if it is not so well attested.

F. J. E. RABY.

Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg, 1925-1926.

Pp. viii + 217. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. R.M. 12.

THIS volume contains seven articles, including 'Montaigne und die Antike,' by Paul Hensel, and 'Triumph und Triumphbogen,' by Ferdinand Noack, an important study of the purpose and architectural development of Roman monumental arches, illustrated by thirty-nine plates.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK).

(1928.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.—October 1. P. K. Baillie-Reynolds, *The Vigiles of Imperial Rome* [Oxford University Press, 1926] (J. Hammer). Of great value; but H. names many relevant authorities—e.g. Jordan and Hülsen—whom B.-R. seems not to have consulted.—October 22. R. Van D. Magoffin, *The Roman Forum* [Bulletin VII., Service Bureau for Classical Teachers of the American Classical League, 1927] (G. McCracken). A brochure of 38 pages, with 50 illustrations; hastily composed, but very valuable for use in schools.—November 12. F. P. Johnson, *Lysippos* [Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1927] (A. D. Fraser). Long and detailed review of an important work; J. is 'better as a scholar than as an art critic.'—Sir Rennell Rodd, *Homer's Ithaca: A Vindication of Tradition* [London: Edward Arnold, 1927] (A. D. Fraser). A clear and honest expression, based on visits in 1926 and 1927, of a view which F. disbelieves; for where is Dulichium and where is Asteris?—December 3. Helen McClees, *The Daily Life of the Greeks and Romans as Illustrated in the Classical Collections* [New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1926] (E. S. McCartney). An illustrated guide to this part of the

Museum; valuable also for general purposes.—Christine Alexander, *Greek Athletics* [New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1925] (E. S. McCartney). A short pamphlet, with good illustrations, mainly written round works in the Museum.

HISTORY.—October 1. J. W. Spaeth Jr., *A Study of the Causes of Rome's Wars from 343 to 265 B.C.* [Princeton, 1926] (J. Hammer). A dissertation for the doctorate. Praised for precision and critical discrimination.—October 8. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* [Oxford University Press, 1926] (C. J. Kraemer Jr.). In effect an account of the decline of civilisation in the second and third centuries, not uninfluenced by current problems. Shows great scholarship and power of synthesis.—M. P. Nilsson, *Imperial Rome* (translated from the Swedish by G. C. Richards) [New York: Harcourt and Brace, n.d.] (C. J. Kraemer Jr.). Useful, but mediocre in its earlier part; highly interesting in its treatment of questions concerning army and population in relation to the 'barbarisation' of the Empire in the third century.—October 29. A. Schulten, *Sertorius* [Leipzig: Dieterich, 1926] (J. Hammer). Highly praised for scholarship, insight, and knowledge of Spanish topography.—November 19. W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation* [London: Edward

Arnold, 1927] (C. J. Kraemer Jr.). Long review, highly favourable; but K. complains of lack of footnotes and maps.—December 3. F. D. Smith, *Athenian Political Commissions* [University of Chicago Libraries, 1920] (G. Calhoun). Dissertation for the doctorate, dealing mainly with the years 411 and 404 B.C.; praised.

LANGUAGE.—December 3. Mary F. Barry, *The Vocabulary of the Moral-Ascetical Works of St. Ambrose*. F. W. A. Dickinson, *The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom* [Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1926] (H. C. Coffin). Vols. X. and XI. in this University's Series of Patristic Studies. Praised as careful and thorough.

LITERATURE.—October 29. S. G. Owen, P. Ovidii Nasonis *Tristium Liber Secundus*, edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary [Oxford University Press, 1924] (J. Hammer). Long review, favourable; H. agrees with O. that the main cause of the poet's exile was political.

SCIENCE.—October 15. M. L. D'Ooge, *Nicomachus of Gerasa: Introduction to Arithmetic. Translated into English, with Studies in Greek Arithmetic*, by F. E. Robbins and L. C. Karpinski [New York: Macmillan, 1926] (D. E. Smith). N.'s treatise on the properties of numbers was probably written about 100 A.D. Long review, mostly favourable.

MUSÉE BELGE. XXXII, Nos. 3-4.

JULY-OCTOBER, 1928.

J. H. Baxter, *Notes on the Latin of St. Ambrose*. P. Van de Woestyne, *C. Julius Hyginus fut-il maître de Virgile?* Colum. I. 1. 13, rightly understood, gives no support. E. Remy, *Dignitas cum otio*. Cic. pro Sest. 98, 100: ad Fam. I. 7. 8, 9: de oratore I. 1. A strong government and a people content with it: otium for C. personally is his freedom as a senator out of office. The passages belong to 56-54 B.C. P. Faider, *Remarques sur le VIII. Livre de l'Énéide* II. vv. 369-406. Skill and delicacy of V.'s handling: 394 recalls phrasing of Lucr. I. 34 and charm of the Aeneadum genitrix. III. vv. 626-728. Arrangement of scenes on shield: haec inter 671 not 'in the centre.' 'V. . . s'entend merveilleusement à orchestrer son poème.' R. Cagnat, *Une inscr. relative à la reine Bérénice*. At Beyrut, associated with her brother. P. d'Hérouville, *Quelques imitations de Virgile*. In Bossuet, Voltaire, etc. J. Hubaux, *L'herbe aux cent têtes*. Plin. N.H. XXII. 20 is misused by J. Carcopino, *La Basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure*, 1927. R. Scalais, *L'influence de la première guerre punique sur l'écon. agraire de l'Italie*. Bad at first, but small farming soon recovered and prospered till ruined by Hannibal. Id. *Le développement du commerce de l'Italie romaine entre la prem. guerre punique et la deuxième*. Trade sought markets, and the government policed the Tus-

can and Adr. seas, but we must not yet speak of economic imperialism. L. Laurand, *Notes pour faciliter l'enseignement des institutions grecques*. Refs. for readings on dress, industry, art, etc. Id., *Eclaircissements sur quelques questions de litt. latine*. Caesar (successive stages of composition): Horace (one villa or two?), etc. L. Herrmann, *Studia Vergiliana*. In Buc. I. 69 aristas=harvests, as Servius and Phillimore C.R. 1916, 146: mea regna recalls Hom. α 47. Buc. X. 76 a gloss due to comparison with Lucr. VI. 783. In Buc. IX. anomalies removed by putting 37-50 between 25 and 26: read 35 Varo and cycno, 37 ego. *Hommage à la mémoire de H. Swoboda*. Contents of *Επιγράμματα*, Reichenberg, 1927. J. Meunier, *Problèmes de critique et d'exégèse concernant les Tragiques grecs*. In Eur. I. T. 484. 7 δέμα subject of νικᾶν, and read ἀν' ἐλπίς (sc. εἴη). Soph. Ichn. 265 μόνον is adv. Eur. Ion 121-4. Ion serves all day but sweeps only at dawn. Hec. 488-91: men think they are issue of gods. Hipp. 958. αε cannot be subj. of inf. H.F. 119-24, read ἀνέκρετες ὡς βάρος πέπων: the colt loses footing and is dragged. M. Leroy, *La conception de l'hist. chez Fronton*. Utterly insincere: only his Letters are of value for himself and his times.

MUSÉE BELGE. BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE. XXXII. Nos. 7-10 (JULY-OCT., 1928).

L. Rochus, *Contes du serment éludé*. Stories from Stobaeus etc. analogous to Hdt. IV. 154 and VI. 86.

GREEK.—(*Anth. Gr. XI.*): A. Linnenkugel, *De Lucillo Tarrhaeo epigrammatum poeta, grammatico, rhetore*, Paderborn, 1926. Ingenious thesis (L. Rochus). *Aristophanes*: M. Meunier, *Les Oiseaux*, trad., 1928, *L'Artisan du Livre*, 15 fr. Favourable (Anon.). *Aristotle*: V. de Falco, *Joannes Pedasimus, in A. Analytica scholia selecta*. Scrupulously careful (A. Delatte). *Eusebius*: H. Doegrens, *E. als Darsteller der griech. Religion*, Paderborn, 1922. Does not fear to show E.'s imperfections (J. Herbillon). *Homer*: E. Bethe, *H. Dichtung u. Sage III.*, Teubner, 1927. Sceptical analysis by A. Severyns. M. Sulzberger, *Les noms propres chez H. et dans la mythologie grecque* (Rev. ét. gr.), 1926. Such study may bring new lights (P. d'Hérouville). *Longus*: G. Valley, *Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des L.*, diss. Upsala, 1926. Opportune and carefully done (A. Tomsin). *Marcus Aurelius*: G. Ghedini, *La lingua greca di M.A., pt. 1: Fonetica e Morfologia*. Milan, 1926. Favourable (Id.). *Plato*: A. Diès, *Autour de P.*, 2 vols, Beauchesne, 1927. Judicious and suggestive (R. Nihard). *Xenophon*: A. Körte, *Aufbau u. Ziel von X. Symposion*, Leipzig, 1927. Favourable (A. Willem).

LATIN.—*Ambrose*: M. S. Kaniecka, *Vita S. A. a Paulino . . . conscripta*, Washington Patr. Studies, 1928. Worthy of rest of collection (L. Rochus). *Amm. Marc.*: G. Thörnelli, *Ad scriptores Hist. Aug. et A. M. adnota-*

- tiones*, pp. 18, Upsala, 1927. Some readings approved by L. Herrmann. *Cicero*: L. Laurand, *C. L'amitié*, Budé, 1928. Text improved and comm. rich (P. d'Hérouville). E. Courbaud, *C. De l'Orateur*, I, II, Budé, 1922-27. Text perhaps too prudent (P. Faider). Th. Pütz, *De M. T. C. bibliotheca*, diss. Münster, 1925. Not more than a good index (Id.). H. Holst, *Die Wortspele in C. Reden*, Oslo, Some 1925, pp. 119. Usable repertory (Id.). H. Sjögren, *Ad C. epp. ad Att. adnotationes*, Upsala, pp. 21. Favourable (L. Herrmann). *Columella*: G. Nyström, *Variatio sermonis hos C.*, diss. Gothenburg, 1926. Useful towards an edition (P. Faider). *Culex*: D. L. Drew, C., Blackwell, 1925. P. d'Hérouville, like E. Galletier, thanks D. but distrusts his conclusions. *Curtius*: F. Helmreich, *Die Reden bei C.*, Paderborn, 1927. Minute, sometimes to excess (L. Rochus). *Palladius*: J. Svennung, *De Auctoribus P.*, Gothenburg, 1927. Favourable (P. d'Hérouville). *Petronius*: G. Suess, *P. imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina*, Dorpat, 1927. Much is irrelevant (L. Herrmann). *Seneca*: W. A. Edward, *Suasoriae of S. the Elder*, Cambridge, 1928. Favourable (J. P. Waltzing). F. Préchac, *S. Des bienfaits t. I. II.*, 1926-7, Budé. His editing now more prudent: attempt to date doubtful (P. Faider). *Tacitus*: P. S. Everts, *De T. hist. conscribendae ratione*, diss. Kerkrade, 1926. Interesting comm. on some passages (Id.). *Valerius Flaccus*: J. Samuelsson, *Ad V. F.*, pp. 12, Upsala. Readings discussed by L. Herrmann. *Virgil*: R. Billiard, *L'agriculture dans l'antiquité d'après les Georg. de V.*, de Boccard, 1928. 100 fr. Favourable (Ed.).
- LINGUISTIC.—C. D. Buck, *Introd. to the Study of the Greek Dialects*, 1927, Ginn. Excellent manual (R. Fohalle). E. Bourguet, *Le dialecte laconien*, Champion, 1927, 30 fr. Sound and complete (Id.). U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Gesch. der griech. Sprache*, Weidmann, 1928. Remarkable lecture, suggesting future tasks (Id.). A. C. Juret, *Système de la syntaxe latine*, Paris, 1928. Ambitious and disturbing: must be read by all for its originality and logic (L. Rochus). P. M. Barone, *Studi sul significato fondamentale dell' accusativo e sulla teoria localista*, Rome, 1926. Favourable (L. Herrmann). K. Van der Heyde, *Composita en Verbaal Aspect bij Plautus*, Amsterdam, 1926. Analysis by L. Rochus. F. Muller, *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen, 1926, 5 m. Excellent instrument for practised hands (J. Mansion). J. Schnetz, *Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung* I, II 1925-7. Contents discussed by J. Mansion.
- GENERAL.—W. M. Ramsay and A. von Premerstein, *Mon. Antiochenum*, Klio, Beiheft, 1927. Discussed by J. P. Waltzing: account taken of it in R. Wirtz, *Mon. Ancyranum*, Münster, 1927, a small edition for classes. E. Pais, *Hist. romaine*, I, 1927. Favourable (L. Halkin). F. Bilabel, *Gesch. Vorderasiens und Aegyptens von 16. bis zum 11. Jhd.* Heidelberg, 1927. Masterly: on Hittites nothing so full hitherto (J. Prickartz). W. Otto, *Kulturgesch. des Altertums*, Munich, 1925. Interesting on doubtful points: valuable for researchers (H. Van de Weerd). A. Mau, *Führer durch Pompeii**, bearb. v. A. Ippel, 1928. Favourable (J. P. Waltzing). J. Toutain, *L'économie antique* (Évol. de l'hum.), 1927. Criticisms by R. Scalais. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kyrene. Vortrag*, 1928. Clear and exact (G. Feytmans). G. Méautis, *L'aristocratie athénienne*, Budé, 1927. Attractive (J. Herbillon). J. Vogt, *Homo Novus. Ein Typus der röm. Rep.*, Stuttgart, 1926. Nothing very new, but clear résumé (H. Van de Weerd). B. Farrington, *Primum Graius Homo*, Camb. 1927. An anthology of Latin translations from Greek. Useful, though very incomplete even for a selection (P. Faider). J. Meunier, *Études de Philologie et d'Hist. Extraits du Musée Belge* (1922 and 1927). Favourable (A. Willem). Abbé G. Bardy, *La litt. grecque chrét.*, Paris, 1927, pp. 187. Useful synthesis, not for specialists (Ed.). E. Fraenkel, *Die Stelle des Römertums in der humanistischen Bildung*, Weidmann, 1926, 45 pp. A. Willem is a little surprised at his complaints on the bad state of Latin studies in Germany. *The Year's Work in Class. Studies*, 1927. Misses work in some French periodicals (P. d'Hérouville). G. Rauschen, *Grundriss der Patrologie**, Freiburg, 1926. Favourable (J. P. W.). Dom C. Butler, *Western Mysticism**, Constable, 1926. Masterly: important 'Afterthoughts' added (P. Debongnie). P. Monceaux, *La vraie légende dorée*, Payot, 1928. Favourable (Ed.). Dom F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie*, fasc. 68-81, I—Justinien, Paris, 1926-7. Strictly scientific and very rich in matter: important articles on Inscriptions etc. (J. P. W.). Mgr. P. Batifol, *St. Grégoire le Grand*, Paris, Le coffre. Favourable (Anon.). A. Blanchet, *La Mosaïque*, Payot, 75 fr. Favourable (Anon.). F. Muller, *Griek. Kunstgeschiedenis (Antieke Cultuur III)*, Groningen, pp. 92. Short survey, mostly of sculpture. Cohen, *De Hellenistische Cultuur* (same, IV). Fills a gap in popular works (A. Willem). R. Ballester, *Hist. de l'Espagne des origines jusqu'à nos jours*, trad. par T. Legrand, 1928, Payot, 25 fr. Impartial and scientific (Ed.). R. Ulich and M. Manitius, *Vagantenlieder aus der lat. Dichtung des 12. u. 13. Jhdts.*, Jena, 1927. Favourable (M. Hélin). H. Rosenberg, *Lat. geistliche Lieder des Mittelalters*, 1924, Freytag, Leipz., and other Deutschkundige Lateintexte (Id.). U. E. Paoli, *Prose e poesie latine di scrittori italiani**, Florence, 1927. Choice arbitrary (P. Faider).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1928).

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Index Verborum a Philone Byzantio in mechanicae syntaxis libris quarto quintoque adhibitorum*. Comp. M.

- Arnim [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. viii + 90] (Ammon). Accurate and serviceable index to Books IV. and V.—*Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori, una cum scholiis X. saeculi*. Ed. et illustr. R. Güngerich [Berlin, 1927, Weidmann. Pp. lxxvi + 95] (Sykutris). Few editions of ancient geographers show so much carefulness and good judgment.—J. L. Heiberg, *Theodosius Sphaerica* and R. Fecht, *Theodosii de habilitatibus liber, de diebus et noctibus libri duo* [Abhandl. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, N.F. XIX., 3 and 4. Pp. xvi + 199 and 176] (Gohlke). The first edition of Th., who deserves to be more widely known. Variant readings of six MSS. given in full; new Latin translation opposite Greek text. Reviewer thanks editors for their patience and skill.
- LATIN LITERATURE.**—*Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri IV*. Rec., praef., app. crit. instr. F. Calonghi [Turin, 1928, Paravia. Pp. viii + 93] (F. Levy). Welcomed by reviewer as a substantial achievement, in spite of differences of opinion about MS. tradition. In general C.'s apparatus is most reliable, and he is cautious in admitting emendations in the text.—T. Frank, *Catullus and Horace. Two poets in their environment* [New York, 1928, Holt and Co. Pp. 291] (Helm). Unites philological exactness with strong powers of combination and skill in presentation.—*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*. Ed. W. Morel [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. vi + 190] (F. Levy). Intended to take place of Baehrens' edition (1886). Careful collection with short textual and exegetical notes.—K. Strecker, *Einführung in das Mittelalter* [Berlin, 1928, Weidmann. Pp. 42] (Manitius). Contains great variety of information, and entirely serves its purpose. Very warmly recommended.
- HISTORY.**—W. Schur, *Scipio Africanus und die Begründung der römischen Welt Herrschaft* [Leipzig, 1927, Dieterich. Pp. 144] (Lenschau). Portrait of Scipio that differs in many points from previous sketches. Tendency to over-estimate, but good observations.
- RELIGION.**—H. M. R. Leopold, *De ontwikkeling van het heidendom in Rome* [Rotterdam, 1918, W. and J. Brusse. Pp. xvi + 162] (Kraemer). This most valuable, full, and clearly arranged book is very warmly recommended by reviewer, who gives detailed summary of contents.
- ARCHAEOLOGY.**—*The Erechtheum*. Measured, drawn, and restored by G. T. Stevens; text by L. D. Caskey, H. N. Fowler, J. M. Paton, G. P. Stevens [Cambridge, Mass., 1927, Harvard Univ. Press] (Dörpfeld). In very lengthy discussion reviewer praises drawings and chapters containing detailed descriptions of Erechtheum, but disagrees with P.'s account of history of building.—A. J. B. Wace, *A Cretan Statuette in the Fitzwilliam Museum. A study in Minoan costume* [Cambridge Univ. Press, 1927. Pp. ix + 49, with 13 plates and 2 figures] (Bieber). Reviewer gives reasons for regarding statuette as forgery, but commends W.'s treatment of Minoan drapery from textile side.—F. Hertlein, O. Paret, P. Gössler, *Die Römer in Württemberg. Teil I. F. Hertlein, Die Geschichte der Besetzung des römischen Württembergs* [Stuttgart, 1928, Kohlhammer. With 14 plates, 3 maps, and 5 figures] (Gündel). Important addition to our knowledge of Roman frontier works in South Germany from Augustan age to fifth century.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Allen (P. S. et H. M.) *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Tom. VII. 1527-8. Pp. xxii + 560. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Arnaldi (F.) *Cicerone*. Pp. viii + 193. Bari: Gius. Laterza e Figli, 1929. Paper, L. 14.
- Babbitt (F. C.) *Plutarch's Moralia*, with an English translation. II. 86B-171F. Pp. xiv + 508. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Bornecque (H.) et Prévost (M.) *Ovide. Héroïdes. Texte établi et traduit*. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Paper, 20 fr.
- Bourguet (E.) *Le Dialecte Laconien*. Pp. 170. (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Soc. de Linguistique de Paris.—XXIII.) Paris: Champion, 1927. Paper.
- Carcopino (J.) *Autour des Gracques*. Pp. 306. (Collection d'Etudes Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Paper, 30 fr.
- Coulon (V.) et van Daele (H.) *Aristophane. Tome IV: Les Thesmophories, Les Grenouilles. Texte établi et traduit*. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Paper.
- Croiset (M.) *Eschyle. Etudes sur l'invention dramatique dans son théâtre*. Pp. viii + 279. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1928. Paper, 20 fr.
- Cuntz (O.) *Itineraria Romana. Volumen prius. Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*. Pp. viii + 139; map. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM 12 (bound, 14).
- Dewing (H. B.) *Procopius, with an English translation. Vol. V. History of the Wars, Books VII (continued) and VIII*. Pp. 441. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Duff (J. D.) *Lucan, with an English translation*. Pp. xv + 638. (Loeb Classical Library.)

- London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Eisler (R.)** *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*. Lieferung 6/7. Pp. 160. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929. Paper.
- Ellis (R.)** *Vellei Paterculi ad M. Vinicium libri duo*. Pp. xxiv + 143. (Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918 (*sic*). Cloth.
- Favez (C.)** *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum liber VI ad Marciam de Consolatione*. Texte latin publié avec une bibliographie, une introduction, un argument analytique, des notes critiques et un commentaire explicatif. Pp. lxxi + 105. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1928. Paper.
- Flexner (A.)** *The Burden of Humanism*. The Taylorian Lecture 1928. Pp. 25. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Paper, 2s. net.
- Fraenkel (E.)** *Iktus und Akzent im lateinischen Sprechvers*. Pp. viii + 425. Berlin: Weidmann, 1928. Paper, M 25.
- Fumaioli (G.)** *La Letteratura Latina nella Cultura Antica*. Pp. 31. Milan: Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero.' Paper.
- Fumaioli (G.)** *L'Oltretomba nell'Eneide di Virgilio*. Saggio critico. Pp. 184. Palermo and Rome: Remo Sandron, 1924. Paper, 8 l.
- Greenwood (L. H. G.)** *Cicero, the Verrine Orations, with an English translation*. Vol. I. Against Caecilius. Against Verres: Part I; Part II, Books I and II. Pp. xxi + 504. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Gulick (C. B.)** *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists*. Vol. II. Pp. viii + 533. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Krahe (H.)** *Lexicon Altilyrischer Personennamen*. Pp. viii + 174. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Dritte Abteilung: Untersuchungen. 9.) Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929. Paper, 10.50 m. (bound, 12.50).
- Kristoferson (H.)** *Declamatio in L. Sergium Catilinam*. Text och tradition. Pp. ix + 168. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1928. Paper, 4 kr.
- Levett (M. J.)** *The Theaetetus of Plato translated*. Pp. 132. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1928. Limp cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Macan (R. W.)** *The Collects . . . rendered into Latin verse*. Pp. xx + 172. Oxford: Blackwell, 1928. Boards, 21s. net.
- Mair (A. W.)** *Oppian, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus, with an English translation*. Pp. lxxx + 636. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Martha (J.)** *Cicéron. Des termes extrêmes des biens et des maux*. Tome I. Livres I-II. Texte établi et traduit. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1928. Paper, 20 fr.
- Mazon (P.)** *Hésiode. Théogonie, Les Travaux et les Jours, Le Bouchier*. Texte établi et traduit. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1928. Paper, 25 fr.
- Mierow (C. C.)** *The Two Cities*. A chronicle of universal history to the year 1146 A.D. by Otto Bishop of Freising. Translated in full with introduction and notes by C. C. M. Edited by A. P. Evans and C. Knapp. Pp. xv + 523. (Records of Civilization.) New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Miller (S. N.)** *The Roman Fort at Kilpatrick on the Antonine Wall*. Pp. xvii + 63; XXVII plates, 3 figures in text. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1928. Cloth, 12. 6d. net.
- Muller (F.) en Renkema (E. H.)** *Beknopt Latijnsch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*. Pp. xii + 1038. Groningen and the Hague: Wolters, 1928. Cloth, 5.90 fl.
- Murray (G.)** *The Oresteia translated into English rhyming verse*. Pp. 266. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Oldfather (W. A.)** *Epictetus, with an English translation*. Vol. II. Discourses, Books III and IV, the Manual, and fragments. Pp. 559. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Orlando (M.)** *Spigolature glottologiche. Quaderno terzo. Il nome 'Italia' nella prosodia, nella fonetica, nella semantica*. Pp. xv + 126. Turin: V. Bona, 1928. Paper, 1. 30.
- Rabehl (W.)** *Die Verskunst der Griechen und Römer*. Eine Einführung. Pp. 30. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1928. Kartoniert, RM 1.
- Randall-MacIver (D.)** *Italy before the Romans*. Pp. 159; 18 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Richmond (O. L.)** *Sexti Properti quae supersunt opera edidit nouoque adparatu critico instruxit O.L.R.* Pp. 431. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Schroeder (O.)** *Euripidis Cantica novis iisque ultimis curis digessit O.S. Canticorum corpori anastatice iterato addenda corrigenda adiecta membrorum conspectus funditus renovatus*. Pp. 215. (Bibliotheca Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. Paper, RM 5.40 (bound, 6).
- The Cambridge Ancient History**. Vol. VII. The Hellenistic monarchies and the rise of Rome. Pp. xxxi + 988; maps, tables, plans, etc. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. Cloth, 37s. 6d. net.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1927-1928**. Edited by S. G. Owen. Pp. x + 134. Bristol: Arrowsmith, 1928. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Tolkien (J.)** *Clementis Ars Grammatica*. Primum edidit J. T. Pp. lx + 113. (Philologus, Supplementband XX, Heft III.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1928. Paper, 12 RM. (bound, 14).
- Williams (W. G.)** *Cicero, The Letters to his Friends, with an English translation*. Vol. II. Pp. xxviii + 632. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1928. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Wormald (R. D.)** *Sensim. A systematic course in Latin unseen translation*. Book I. Pp. 94. London: Arnold. Cloth, 1s. 9d.
- Yale Classical Studies**. Vol. I. Pp. 252. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.

MAY 2 • 1925